

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, April 24, 1996

The House met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. RADANOVICH].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 24, 1996.

I hereby designate the Honorable GEORGE P. RADANOVICH to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Help us to acknowledge, O gracious God, that Your creation extends from the east to the west, that there is no boundary to Your goodness and Your grace. Forgive us when we seek to make our action the center of all action and our concerns the focus of all humanity. Remind us that we ought not remake Your graces to look only like our face or make our concerns to be the center of Your entire creation. As You are the God of all so let us focus on Your blessings and Your will in every place and for every person so that justice will flow down as waters and righteousness like an everflowing stream. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FLANAGAN] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FLANAGAN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution to correct the enrollment of the bill S. 735, to prevent and punish acts of terrorism, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution to correct the enrollment of the bill S. 735, to prevent and punish acts of terrorism, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain fifteen 1-minute presentations from each side of the aisle.

MEDICARE

(Ms. DUNN of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about Medicare. Yesterday the Treasury Department reported a new and totally unexpected \$4.2 billion shortfall in the Medicare trust fund during the first half of the current fiscal year. Just a year ago, this very same fund had projected a surplus of \$45 million for fiscal year 1996.

My parents, the Blackburns in Bellevue, WA, probably did not read that news story, but it is critically important to them because they, like millions of others, count on the Medicare system being solvent. More than a year ago President Clinton's Medicare trustees, including three members of his own Cabinet, warned that Medicare would be bankrupt by 2002 if no changes were made. Yet the President did nothing to change it. He offered no long-term solutions and he offered no leadership. In fact, all he offered was election year scare tactics designed to frighten senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. Congressional Republicans in response to people like my parents have offered leadership. We want to save benefits for our seniors and save the Medicare trust fund, and we want to do it now while it is still possible.

RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, there are 117,000 minimum wage workers in North Carolina. Those workers are not just numbers, they are people with families and children. They are day care providers, farmers and food service workers, mechanics and machine operators. They are in construction work and sales, health and cleaning services, and a range of other occupations.

Their families helped build America, and they can help rebuild it. They do not need charity, they need a check—a check that includes a reasonable increase in the minimum wage, as proposed by the President.

Work should be a benefit, it should not be a burden. Work is a burden when, despite an individual's best efforts, living is a daily struggle. Work is a benefit when enough is earned to pay for what we need.

Reward work, and pass the minimum wage increase.

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF VIETNAM WAR MUSEUM IN CHICAGO

(Mr. FLANAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLANAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Vietnam Memorial Museum, in the heart of the Vietnamese community in Chicago, for its commitment to uniting both American and Vietnamese veterans on issues relating to Vietnam and veterans' affairs.

The museum was founded 10 years ago with the intent of honoring those who participated and served in the Vietnam war and educating future generations about personal experiences of those who performed such service. It contains a fascinating exhibit of various memorabilia, artifacts, photographs, artwork, and period publications, reminding us all of the sacrifices made by our veterans during the Vietnam war.

The Vietnam Memorial Museum of Chicago is not a war museum. It is a memorial, a place where those who survived the hardships of the Vietnam war can meet, reflect on their personal experiences and share memories and emotions.

The museum also serves the community by housing a drop-off center where American and Vietnamese veterans channel valuable goods to needy Vietnamese refugees living in the Chicago area. This museum is truly a community based and community oriented operation.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

The Vietnam War Museum is a tribute to Vietnam veterans and their families and all veterans. It is a valuable resource to the Chicagoland community that honors all, veterans and civilians alike, who served our country during the Vietnam era on behalf of the cause of freedom.

THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Mrs. KENNELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about increasing the minimum wage. I would like to focus on one particular type of low-wage worker—women. Almost 60 percent of those making minimum wage are female. Many times, these are women with children to support—women whose alternative would be to go on welfare. As one who has participated in the debate on welfare reform for many years, I can tell you this: The single best way to keep people off welfare is to make work pay.

Raising the minimum wage will make an enormous difference for many of these families. For them, it would mean an extra \$1,800 a year to put in the family bank account. This one increase equates to an average spent for 7 months of groceries, or 4 months of housing, or 9 months of utility bills. This is no time for political games—raising the minimum wage is long overdue. The wage earners struggling to support their families know it. The President has said and I agree: if you work full-time, year-round, you shouldn't be poor. Raising the minimum wage takes us toward that goal. I believe we should raise it now.

IMPROVING THE NATION

(Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, like a chain, in order to improve our Nation we must strengthen even the weakest links in our society. By doing so it would make it more likely that under known or unknown pressures, we would be able to pull together rather than fall apart as a nation.

Hope and opportunity are key elements. They go hand in hand with success. It is hard to have one without the other. However, for many in our inner cities, opportunities seem limited. Thus hopelessness often creeps into their lives, and the prospect of success becomes nothing more than a pipe dream. We as leaders owe our society much more, but, unlike the beliefs of many, we do not have to throw taxpayers' dollars at the problem. There are other solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I will soon be offering initiatives that in a meaningful way

will attempt to address these grave concerns.

SOMETHING IS WRONG

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, Rodney Hamrick, who is in prison for threatening the life of Ronald Reagan, threatened to blow up a Federal courthouse, a judge, the NAACP headquarters, and an airplane. Then he went beyond and he sent a bomb in the mail, that did not explode, to the U.S. attorney that had convicted him. He was naturally convicted.

But a three-judge panel at the Fourth Circuit Court overturned the decision by saying, since the bomb did not detonate, it was not deadly. Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. I believe that these three judges must have received a defective mail-order law degree from Sears Roebuck. Something is wrong when Gorbachev gets slapped in the face in Russia while campaigning and they call it an assassination. In America, a prisoner sends a mail bomb and it is treated like a misdemeanor. If that does not explain it all, I do not know what does.

MORE MEDICARE

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well once again heartened by the remarks of my colleague from the great State of Ohio. I just wish we could get past some of the name calling and some of the, to be frank, disinformation that has infested itself here on the banks of the Potomac; to wit, fact, yesterday the Treasury Department reports that Medicare is losing money, \$4.2 billion in the first 6 months of this year.

Yet what does the minority leader say on television? Last summer, when queried about allowing Medicare to grow at a rate less than 10 percent a year, he says, and I am quoting him, the reforms the majority tried to make amounted to this, "This is a hoax."

Mr. Speaker, it is no hoax. The hoax comes when those on the left would deliberately employ medi-scare tactics to try and get through the next election rather than to save and transform Medicare for the next generation. We are all to be held accountable. Let us deal with the truth.

ALCOHOL AND CHILDREN

(Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we in this country, every one of us understands what this sign says. It is three frogs saying Budweiser. The trouble is that if you ask the average fourth and fifth graders in this country, they also know what it says. They know what it says more than they know what Tony the Tiger says. They know more about Budweiser than they know about Smokey Bear or the Mighty Morphin Power Rangers.

People that do not think there is a problem with young people drinking alcohol in this country do not understand the facts. Alcohol abuse kills more young people in America than all other drugs combined. Junior high school and high school students drink 1.1 billion cans of beer each year, and Anheuser Busch's market share of this number is 70 million 6-packs of Budweiser, equaling \$200 million of sales to children.

Let us put an end to trying to market to children a drug that unnecessarily kills far too many of our Nation's most vital natural resources.

APPRECIATING BALANCE

(Mr. TAUZIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, every spring I plant natural resource trees, over the past 2 months, nearly 600: crab apples, redbuds, oaks, cherries, dogwoods, cypress, and cedar, just to name a few. I also cut down trees, mostly stunted or overgrown pine, to make room for others to grow. I was raised to appreciate that kind of balance.

This spring I will join other volunteers in Habitat for Humanity, hammering and sawing lumber to build suitable housing for poor families in Louisiana. I was raised to understand that kind of balance, too.

Unfortunately, many of our bureaucrats do not. Every week nearly 1 square mile of Louisiana washes away in coastal marsh and barrier island erosion. Private landowners are prepared to spend their own money to save those marshes and wetlands, but our wetlands permit system says no. Hundreds of such applications have been abandoned.

The Corps of Engineers in Louisiana still refuses as yet to authorize a private mitigation bank. So 30 to 50 square miles in my State washes away while bureaucrats squabble over so-called wetlands that no self-respecting duck would land on.

We need to spend less money on lawyers and bureaucrats and more money really saving wetlands in America.

SUPPORT H.R. 3244

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Capital of the United States is in serious disrepair, and I mean a lot more than potholes. It is trying to recover by downsizing a loan as no insolvent city has ever done. There is Federal responsibility here, including the unfunded pension liability that is taking 10 percent of our budget, and that is entirely my colleagues' responsibility.

The time has come to act now. We are a hemorrhaging population. We want to revive the District the old-fashioned way, by keeping and attracting middle-income residents here. Please support my Federal tax cut bill for the District of Columbia; support H.R. 3244. My colleagues should assume their share of the responsibility for the Capital of the United States.

TRAVEL AND TOURISM SHRINKS TRADE IMBALANCE

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, did my colleagues see yesterday where the trade deficit is down by over 18 percent? Now that is something to cheer about.

But do my colleagues know why the trade deficit is down? According to the Commerce Department, it is because the travel and tourist industry reported a temporary surge in foreign visitors to the United States. Unfortunately, this trend cannot continue unless we in Congress work right now to continue the trend by passing the Travel and Tourism Partnership Act.

Now we have 226 cosponsors. That is terrific. I want everyone to cosponsor this bill. We want to do even more, because terrific is not good enough when it comes to travel and tourism.

Travel and tourism is the largest industry in America. Travel and tourism employs one out of every nine working Americans, and it is time that we in Congress, and we are, awaken to the tremendous potential in this industry, and I ask everyone to help me.

Let us cosponsor this bill, and let us pass it so we can get our trade deficit down even further.

GIVE OUR STUDENTS AN OPPORTUNITY TO WORK THEIR WAY THROUGH SCHOOL

(Mr. FLAKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, one of the great arguments that I have heard in this debate about the minimum wage has been that there are many students who receive minimum wage. I stand here this morning as a product of the family of 13 children, parents who

could not afford to send me to college, and the only way I could get through was to work.

I do not see anything wrong with trying to provide a wage that allows a student to be able to work their way through school particularly when we are cutting back in so many areas that affect and impact the lives of students who have been able to get scholarships, be able to get grants and loans. It seems to me that if we are going to be fair, we have to be fair to every American citizen, even those who are students who have a desire, a will, to work.

Mr. Speaker, my mother taught me how to cook, wash, iron, and sew. That is how I got through college. There are many other young people who could do the same thing if we were fair enough to them to give them that opportunity, give them the best wages. I have waited tables, I have bussed tables, I have shined shoes, I have done everything, and we ought to let them do it. Pay them a good enough salary so that we can indeed come to that point where maybe if we reduce the scholarships, they will know they can work their way through.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a good thing. I am a product and a witness of it.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PARENTAL FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Parental Freedom of Information Act to provide parents in America with the information they need to guide the education of their children. Teachers have told me that involved parents are the most important thing the public schools need to help students learn. Involved parents must be informed parents.

The Parental Freedom of Information Act will guarantee that parents have access to their child's curriculum, the contents and result of standardized tests and medical records, including psychiatric and/or counseling records.

Recently, parents have been denied access to instructional materials used in classes which they might find objectionable. They have been denied achievement tests that have been administered and then withheld from parental inspection, and treatments by unqualified school counselors have been administered to children contrary to the expressed objections of parents, and the records of this treatment were denied to the parents. Parents have been forced into the courtroom to find out what is going on in the classroom.

This act in no way seeks to influence curriculum or standardized tests. It simply provides the basic information

which involved parents need to guide the education of their children.

RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Mr. WYNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, good morning. The battle about the minimum wage rages on. Some people would have our colleagues believe that the minimum wage only affects kids, so we should not worry about it. Not true—10 million Americans are affected by the minimum wage. Some 75 percent of them are adults and 58 percent of them are women.

We need to increase the minimum wage. The minimum wage has not been increased in 5 years. The purchasing power of people who earn the minimum wage has decreased by 15 percent. We are talking about people who make about \$8,400 a year operating under the current minimum wage.

I am pleased to say today, Mr. Speaker, that there is some bipartisan support for increasing the minimum wage. I am distressed, however, that there are still some Republicans who believe that we should not increase the minimum wage and want to fight it.

We do not need any convoluted bureaucratic plans to pay employers. What we need is a very simple solution: Raise the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, if we raise the minimum wage, we will bring 300,000 families out of poverty, we will bring 100,000 children out of poverty.

Raise the minimum wage.

MINIMUM WAGE: MINIMUM OPPORTUNITIES

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I really wonder if the President and the Democrats are truly interested in raising the minimum wage or is it just that they want to score some political points? When they controlled Congress back in 1992 and 1993 with President Clinton in the White House, why was not an increase in the minimum wage on the agenda? Maybe they were too busy raising taxes on gas, on Social Security, on small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I have to look at this comment that the President made in 1993. President Clinton said, "The minimum wage," and I am quoting, "The minimum wage is the wrong way to raise incomes of low-wage earners." But then again, I guess we really cannot believe what the President says from day to day or time to time.

By the way, if my colleagues think 90 cents an hour is going to save working families, I say my colleagues' priorities

are in the wrong place. We need to provide tax relief to our families, not 90 cents an hour. Lowering taxes will raise incomes.

FAMILIES NEED TO EARN A LIVABLE WAGE

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a lot of excuses from the majority these days about why we do not need to increase the minimum wage. Mr. Speaker, I know firsthand why families need to earn a livable wage.

Over 28 years ago I was a single working mother with three small children, receiving no child support. Even though I was working, I was earning so little that I had to go on welfare to take care of my children. I tell my colleagues this, Mr. Speaker, because too many families today face the same situation.

In spite of what the majority whip has said about minimum wage and about earning \$4.25 an hour, almost 5 million Americans work for at or below minimum wage, and I am not talking about teenagers looking for extra cash. Rather, the average minimum wage earner looks a lot like I did 28 years ago, an adult woman supporting her family by herself. Today that mother is worse off because the purchasing power of the minimum wage has plummeted to a 40-year low.

Clearly, it is time to make work pay by increasing the minimum wage now.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GILBERT MURRAY

(Mr. HERGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Gilbert Murray, former President of the California Forestry Association. Today marks the 1-year anniversary of Gil's tragic death at the hands of the Unabomber.

Today, I will not dwell on the tragedy of Gil's death, but rather on the greatness of his life. Gil was a respected professional leader. He advocated good stewardship of our forests to keep them beautiful and productive for our children and grandchildren.

More importantly, Gil was a leader in his home. Despite his professional commitments, he always made his family his priority. He was never too busy for his wife and two sons.

In every way Gilbert Murray was an exemplary man. I speak for many in northern California in saying that we remember him fondly and miss him greatly.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE HAVE SPOKEN: RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the American people have spoken. The latest polls show that 85 percent of Americans are in favor of raising the minimum wage.

I will say to my Republican colleagues, they have lost the battle in the court of public opinion.

So what does the Republican leadership now plan to do? Instead of following the will of the American people, they are following the will of corporate America and the fat cats who have funded their campaigns. That is immoral.

The latest Republican shell game will eliminate the earned income tax credit and then exclude workers without children from getting a raise. The rationale is to save \$15 billion and give more breaks to big, big business. This ridiculous proposal takes working families one step forward and knocks them two steps back.

My colleagues, if we want to help working families, we must insist on a clean minimum wage bill with no strings attached, and vote to raise the minimum wage without delay.

RENEWABLE ENERGY EXPO 1996

(Mr. SCHAEFER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge Members to visit the Renewable Energy Expo 1996, taking place today from noon to 3 p.m. in the Cannon Caucus Room.

This exhibit, being sponsored by three dozen trade associations, industry groups, and businesses, offers you the opportunity to inspect the latest American renewable energy and energy-efficient technologies. You can ask the groups' representatives questions about their projects throughout the country, including some which may be operating in your own district.

The renewable energy expo is being put on in cooperation with the House Renewable Energy Caucus, a bipartisan group I founded in February along with six other Members. This caucus has grown 10 times in size—to 70 members—in less than 3 months, demonstrating the broad support renewables enjoy in Congress and throughout the country, renewables for our children and their grandchildren.

I hope you can stop by the Cannon Caucus Room today to see vivid demonstrations of our country's energy future.

REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP DENIES MINIMUM-WAGE WORKERS EVEN EXIST

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues are reaching new heights of desperation as they scurry to dodge a vote on raising the minimum wage, even though the minimum wage is at a 40-year low, even though a 90-cent increase would help over 10 million workers in this country, and even though the average minimum-wage worker brings home more than half of his or her family's income.

It might be interesting to note that Members of this Congress earned more during the shutdown of this Government during the Christmas holidays than a full-time minimum-wage worker makes in an entire year. But despite all that, the Republican leadership will go to any length to kill an increase in the minimum wage. They are not even afraid of resorting to fantasy.

Yesterday the House majority whip said, "Emotional appeals about working families trying to get by on \$4.25 an hour are hard to resist. Fortunately, such families don't really exist."

They do not believe that people do exist on the \$8,500 a year or are trying to exist on that amount of money. Tell it to the 300,000 families in this country who are minimum-wage workers. Let us go to a clean, straight vote on raising the minimum wage.

LIBERALS REACHING NEW HEIGHTS IN DEMAGOGUERY

(Mrs. SEASTRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, the liberals in Congress have reached new heights in demagoguery in the last few months, and with the help of the liberal media and the big special interests, AFL-CIO, they have been able to label anything that Republicans attempt to do as extreme or radical.

Mr. Speaker, truth always has a way of rearing its ugly head, and while the liberal Democrats were misleading Americans about the environment and while they were out demagoguing about the balanced budget, the Medicare Program has incurred the largest losses in its history.

□ 1130

In the first half of this fiscal year Medicare has lost \$4.2 billion, and I would just say it has got to be true because I am holding the Santa Barbara News-Press, owned by the New York Times, and here is the front page article from the April 22 issue: "Medicare Trust Fund Loses \$4 Billion. Clinton Administration Downplays Apparent

Miscalculations." So as I said, even the liberal press is exposing that, and I would just say the President vetoed it and now we see his party's inaction on solving and preserving Medicare.

REPUBLICANS FIX MEDICARE BY CUTTING BENEFITS

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, here they go again. My colleagues on the other side, the Republicans, are now talking about how they want to fix Medicare essentially by cutting Medicare and using the money to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy. We had this all through 1995. Now they are trying to distort the information that came out in the New York Times about the Medicare trust fund, to go ahead with their radical plan to cut Medicare in order to pay for these tax breaks for wealthy Americans.

Well, let me tell the Members that this trust fund is not broke. We know now that it has \$126.1 billion in surplus. This small deficit that was incurred in the first 6 months of this year does not justify going ahead with this radical plan to cut Medicare and give back these tax breaks to wealthy Americans.

The Republican leadership has refused to sit down with President Clinton and try to work on a bipartisan basis to come up with an answer for Medicare to make sure it is solvent. We are not talking about today. We are not even talking about the next few years. This insolvency, if it occurs, is I think 2001 or 2002. Do not let it be an excuse on the part of the Republicans to give these tax breaks to wealthy Americans.

INTRODUCING THE REGULATORY FAIR WARNING ACT

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, too often we hear stories about the small businessman who hires and employs three or four people, and then gets slapped with a legal action by a Federal agency on a matter on which the small businessman knows very little about its background or its effect. So what does a small businessman have as an option? One, he can hire a lawyer to try to defend against a wrong about which he did not know; or, in the second place, just pay the fine or other sanction that the agency requires because that is the easiest way to go.

I am today introducing the Regulatory Fair Warning Act, which would require the agencies to provide reasonable notice ahead of time of the change of a regulation or how it is to be en-

forced so that the small businessman, the employer, can try to comply with that without having been hit with a legal action, not knowing what he was supposed to do. This is a fair warning whose time has come.

REPUBLICAN MEDICARE CURE IS WORSE THAN THE AILMENT

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues who come here to sound an alarm on Medicare, even though this alleged shortfall has already been known by CBO and they have taken it into account, although almost every year we have been responding within Ways and Means to make sure the Medicare fund stays solvent.

The trouble with the Republican approach is that their cure has been far worse than the ailment, a heavy hit on seniors and providers to fund a tax cut for a very wealthy few. Their proposal gambles with the health of older Americans by excessive expenditure cuts and risky proposals.

In contrast, the President has proposed a plan that would extend the solvency of the part A hospital insurance trust fund through the next decade without hurting seniors.

What the Republicans are doing, sounding an alarm to put out a fire, they want to tear down the Medicare house. The public rejected it last year. They will reject it again this year.

THE PRESIDENT'S SOFT AND LIBERAL JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS

(Mr. FUNDERBURK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, what the President does and what he says about judicial appointments are the mental equivalent of the great Joe Montana's play action, fake to the right and run to the left—and in this case, it is talking tough and acting soft. The President constantly talks about putting 100,000 cops on the beat but his judicial appointments are releasing felons back on the streets where they can again prey on the unsuspecting American public. We need more than just laws against felons if the soft and liberal judges appointed by the President simply ignore the law and free them. What we really need are judges that will adhere to the spirit and letter of the law and punish violent criminals to the full extent of the law. We must not punish the American public again by allowing this disgraceful revolving door of justice.

If we want judges who are as concerned about the rights of law-abiding

citizens and victims as they are about those of violent criminals, then we need a new President in the White House.

SUPPORT A CLEAN MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE

(Ms. MCKINNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I sent this letter to my colleague from Georgia, Speaker GINGRICH, urging him to hold a vote on a clean minimum wage increase before the Memorial Day district work period.

And today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate on the floor of the House what I stated to Speaker GINGRICH in this letter.

In the letter I said:

The false link you are creating between a minimum wage increase and a reduction in worker protections, is little more than a cynical ploy to convince people earning \$3,400 a year that less safe working conditions are the price they must pay for a living wage. This Machiavellian approach is insensitive to the needs of thousands of working Georgians who struggle just to put food on the table. As of 1994, 11.9% of Georgia's workforce was earning between \$4.25 and \$5.14 an hour. A 90-cent increase would help these nearly 362,000 people make ends meet.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleague from the Sixth District of Georgia to permit a vote on a clean minimum wage increase.

CAMPAIGN REFORM

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, during the 104th Congress, we have made some very positive changes in how we do business around here. We have legislated more stringent lobbyist registration requirements, disclosure requirements of their activities. We have passed a new House rule that prohibits Members and staffs from accepting any gifts, including meals or event tickets, from lobbyists or any other individuals other than family and close friends.

This is a good start, but it has not changed the persistent perception across our country that special interest groups have an edge over individual contributors when it comes to election time.

Our next step is to change how we run our campaigns. I have introduced H.R. 3274 to do just that. My bill does limit PAC contributions, and it requires that contributions come from within the candidate's State and that 50 percent of contributions come from within the candidate's district. If we are here to represent the people from our district, then they are the ones that should help us get here. They are

the Americans we work for and are accountable to.

It is time for meaningful campaign reform. We can pass some. We should do it. It makes sense.

AMERICA'S WORKING FAMILIES NEED AN INCREASED WORKING WAGE

(Mr. FAZIO of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, when Franklin D. Roosevelt first proposed a national minimum wage, he described it as a "fair day's pay for a fair day's work." Now, 50 years later, the minimum wage has plummeted to its lowest value ever and its purchasing power has fallen to a 40-year low. On an annual income of \$3,400 a year, paying the bills and keeping food on the table is a daily challenge for minimum wage workers.

The 90-cent increase proposed by the President and Democrats in Congress would make the minimum wage a living wage. An extra 90 cents an hour would pay for 7 months of groceries, a year of health care costs, 9 months of utility bills, or 4 months of housing.

Contrary to Republican rhetoric, the average minimum wage worker is not a teenager looking for a little extra cash. She is a working mother, often the only wage earner in her family.

Let us not load up a minimum wage increase with all sorts of special breaks and goodies that would cause the President to veto the bill.

America's working families need an increased working wage, protections for their pensions, an effective education for their children, and affordable health care. Is that too much to ask?

Let us start by raising the minimum wage.

WAKEUP CALL

(Mr. BAKER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, politicians excoriate liberal judges for releasing dangerous criminals and the Clinton appointees are among the worst. But defense and plaintiff attorneys have found an even greater ally, the bleeding-heart juries.

Half of the jury in the first case hung up the jury saying the Menendez brothers who murdered their parents for insurance money were afraid of their parents and should be released. It reminds me of the case in Richmond, CA, where the burglar fell through the roof and sued the property owner for having a faulty roof and won. Yesterday's decision that Bernhard Goetz who defended himself from subway muggers should pay \$43 million because he injured one of the muggers was among the worst cases.

The real problem is not just liberal judges or bleeding-heart juries but a lack of absolute values. Our Nation's switch to situational ethics does not allow us to hold people responsible for their own misdeeds.

Should people who murder their parents prosper? Should burglars sue innocent property owners? Should thugs and muggers enrich themselves through court action when their victims rise up and defend themselves.

Wake up, America, before your ability to move safely in urban areas joins the 40 percent of your income taken by a loving and caring government.

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole under the 5-minute rule:

Committee on Agriculture; Committee on Banking and Financial Services; Committee on Commerce; Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities; Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; Committee on International Relations; Committee on the Judiciary; Committee on National Security; Committee on Resources; Committee on Science; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADANOVICH). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 175, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 411 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 411

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 175) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, modified by striking title II of the joint resolution. The joint resolution as modified shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution as modified to final passage without intervening motion except one

motion to recommit. The motion to recommit may include instructions only if offered by the minority leader or his designee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from South Boston, MA [Mr. MOAKLEY], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration in the House of House Joint Resolution 175, making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996. It provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee.

It orders the previous question to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit which, if containing instructions, may only be offered by the minority leader or his designee.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also modifies House Joint Resolution 175 by striking out title II, which contained language to recapitalize the Savings Association insurance fund, better known as SAIF, and avoid another taxpayer bailout of yet another deposit insurance fund. Let me underscore that again. The plan was designed to avoid a taxpayer bailout and look for a private sector solution. This is an unfortunate but necessary step that was taken by the Rules Committee because passage of this 1-day continuing resolution is needed to forestall a disruption in Government services while congressional leaders and the administration work out the details of a permanent continuing resolution. As my colleagues know, the funding authority that much of the Government is currently now operating under expires in about 12 hours and 16 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to explain why I believe that the SAIF recapitalization legislation is needed, and why I hope that the majority and minority leadership in both the House and the Senate will work with the administration to bring this legislation before the House just as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. Speaker, because the bank insurance fund became fully capitalized last year, deposit insurance premiums to that fund fell from 23 cents per \$100 to 4 cents. Consequently, there is a premium disparity that exists now between the bank insurance fund and the Savings Association insurance fund.

□ 1145

That creates a situation that could undermine the competitive balance between the two industries.

To address this disparity, language was added to House Joint Resolution 175, but stricken by this rule, to require thrifts to pay a one-time assessment of \$5.5 billion to recapitalize the Savings Association Insurance Fund. The Bank Insurance Fund would assume 75 percent of the responsibility for annual payments on the financing corporation bonds used to pay for the 1987 thrift industry rescue plan.

In return, Mr. Speaker, banks would receive a rebate of up to \$500 million for excessive premiums paid to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the two FDIC funds would be merged in 2 years.

The reason the legislation is needed to be enacted sooner rather than later is that, to avoid the premium disparity, many thrifts will seek to transfer their deposits to BIF-insured institutions. If this happens, there will not be enough premiums in the safe to cover the \$600 million a year in FICA bond obligations. That could happen by the end of this year, forcing a Government default and sometime thereafter another potential Federal bailout of the S&L insurance fund.

Every banking regulator agrees that the system needs to be fixed today, including the FDIC, the Treasury Department, the Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan. In fact, as Chairman Greenspan pointed out in a March 4 letter he sent to my California colleague, Mr. ROYCE, he said,

Even if there were no evolving problem with two different insurance premiums, the existing deposit insurance system, with its reliance on two funds, is inherently unstable.

Mr. Speaker, the safe recapitalization legislation is the first step toward merging the funds and the industries. Today there is little of a material nature that distinguishes a bank charter from a thrift charter. The consequences of having two funds is that one industry can have a competitive advantage, even though the funds are both operated by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. This is not a logical deposit insurance system.

Many of my friends in the banking industry argue that they should not have to help pay for the thrift bailout because banks did not cause the problem. Mr. Speaker, neither did the well-run, healthy thrifts cause the problem that exists today.

Since the only other option, which is another taxpayer bailout of a deposit insurance fund, is not a realistic option from my perspective, the only solution is a shared private sector solution. The result will be to enhance the safety and soundness of the banking system, benefiting consumers of financial products and services and strengthening the competitiveness and long-term health and profitability of the industry.

Mr. Speaker, Congress' failure to deal with a looming threat to the deposit insurance system 10 years ago led to the biggest financial calamity since the Great Depression. Let us not make that same mistake twice. There will be no better opportunity than now to deal with this problem, and I look forward to working with the leadership, the gentleman from Iowa, Chairman LEACH, and the administration, to get this matter once and for all resolved.

In the meantime, we must address the need to keep the Government operating. So I urge adoption of this rule and adoption of the one-day continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following material:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of April 23, 1996]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	62	59
Modified Closed ³	49	47	26	25
Closed ⁴	9	9	17	16
Total	104	100	105	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of April 23, 1996]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 62 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 95 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 925	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	O	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: 257-155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate			PQ: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: 217-211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 423-1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: 228-204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	O	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 253-172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of April 23, 1996]

H. Res. No. (Date rpt.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414-4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252-170 A: 255-168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225-191 A: 233-183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223-180 A: 245-155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232-196 A: 236-191 (6/20/95).
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 221-178 A: 217-175 (6/22/95).
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95).
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PQ: 236-194 A: 234-192 (6/29/95).
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps.	PQ: 235-193 D: 192-238 (7/12/95).
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 230-194 A: 229-195 (7/13/95).
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PQ: 232-192 A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95).
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95).
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996	A: 230-189 (7/25/95).
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: voice vote (8/1/95).
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 2126	Defense Approps. FY 1996	A: 409-1 (7/31/95).
H. Res. 207 (8/1/95)	MC	H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	A: 255-156 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 208 (8/1/95)	O	H.R. 2127	Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996	A: 323-104 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 215 (9/7/95)	O	H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 216 (9/7/95)	MO	H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 218 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lockbox	A: voice vote (9/13/95).
H. Res. 219 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act	A: 414-0 (9/13/95).
H. Res. 222 (9/18/95)	O	H.R. 1617	CAREERS Act	A: 388-2 (9/19/95).
H. Res. 224 (9/19/95)	O	H.R. 2274	Natl. Highway System	PQ: 241-173 A: 375-39-1 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 225 (9/19/95)	MC	H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty & Dem. Solidarity	A: 304-118 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 226 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 743	Team Act	A: 344-65-1 (9/27/95).
H. Res. 227 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 228 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1601	Internatl. Space Station	A: voice vote (9/27/95).
H. Res. 230 (9/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 108	Continuing Resolution FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 234 (9/29/95)	O	H.R. 2405	Omnibus Science Auth.	A: voice vote (10/1/95).
H. Res. 237 (10/17/95)	MC	H.R. 2259	Disapprove Sentencing Guidelines	A: voice vote (10/18/95).
H. Res. 238 (10/18/95)	MC	H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	PQ: 231-194 A: 227-192 (10/19/95).
H. Res. 239 (10/19/95)	C	H.R. 2492	Leg. Branch Approps.	PQ: 235-184 A: voice vote (10/31/95).
H. Res. 245 (10/25/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 109	Social Security Earnings Reform	PQ: 228-191 A: 235-185 (10/26/95).
H. Res. 251 (10/31/95)	C	H.R. 2491	Seven-Year Balanced Budget	A: 237-190 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 252 (10/31/95)	MO	H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban	A: 241-181 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 257 (11/7/95)	C	H.R. 2546	D.C. Approps.	A: 216-210 (11/8/95).
H. Res. 258 (11/8/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Res. FY 1996	A: 220-200 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 259 (11/9/95)	O	H.R. 2586	Debt Limit	A: voice vote (11/14/95).
H. Res. 261 (11/9/95)	C	H.R. 2539	ICC Termination Act	A: 223-182 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 262 (11/9/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Resolution	A: 220-185 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 269 (11/15/95)	O	H.R. 2586	Increase Debt Limit	A: voice vote (11/16/95).
H. Res. 270 (11/15/95)	C	H.R. 2564	Lobbying Reform	A: 229-176 (11/15/95).
H. Res. 273 (11/16/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 122	Further Cont. Resolution	A: 239-181 (11/17/95).
H. Res. 284 (11/29/95)	O	H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia	A: voice vote (11/30/95).
H. Res. 287 (11/30/95)	O	H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform	A: voice vote (12/6/95).
H. Res. 293 (12/7/95)	C	H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act	PQ: 223-183 A: 228-184 (12/14/95).
H. Res. 303 (12/13/95)	O	H.R. 2621	Protect Federal Trust Funds	PQ: 230-188 A: 229-189 (12/19/95).
H. Res. 309 (12/18/95)	C	H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands	A: voice vote (12/20/95).
H. Res. 313 (12/19/95)	O	H.Con. Res. 122	Budget Res. w/President	Tabled (2/28/96).
H. Res. 323 (12/21/95)	O	H.R. 558	Texas Low-Level Radioactive	PQ: 228-182 A: 244-168 (2/28/96).
H. Res. 365 (2/7/96)	MC	H.R. 2677	Natl. Parks & Wildlife Refuge	A: voice vote (3/7/96).
H. Res. 368 (2/28/96)	O	H.R. 2854	Farm Bill	PQ: 233-152 A: voice vote (3/21/96).
H. Res. 371 (3/5/96)	C	H.R. 994	Small Business Growth	PQ: 234-187 A: 237-183 (3/21/96).
H. Res. 372 (3/5/96)	MC	H.R. 3021	Debt Limit Increase	A: 244-166 (3/22/96).
H. Res. 380 (3/12/96)	MC	H.R. 3019	Cont. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232-180 A: 232-177 (3/28/96).
H. Res. 384 (3/14/96)	MC	H.R. 2703	Effective Death Penalty	PQ: 229-186 A: voice vote (3/29/96).
H. Res. 386 (3/20/96)	C	H.R. 2202	Immigration	PQ: 232-168 A: 234-162 (4/15/96).
H. Res. 388 (3/20/96)	C	H.J. Res. 165	Further Cont. Approps.	A: voice vote (4/17/96).
H. Res. 391 (3/27/96)	C	H.R. 125	Gun Crime Enforcement	
H. Res. 392 (3/27/96)	MC	H.R. 3136	Contract w/America Advancement	
H. Res. 395 (3/29/96)	MC	H.R. 3103	Health Coverage Affordability	
H. Res. 396 (3/29/96)	O	H.J. Res. 159	Tax Limitation Const. Amdmt.	
H. Res. 409 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 842	Truth in Budgeting Act	
H. Res. 410 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 2715	Paperwork Elimination Act	
H. Res. 411 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 1675	Natl. Wildlife Refuge	
		H.J. Res. 175	Further Cont. Approps. FY 1996	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; D-defeated; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today the House is considering a noncontroversial 1-day temporary spending bill. Although today's continuing resolution is the 13th since last October, we finally can see the light at the end of the tunnel of continuing resolutions.

As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues are just about to complete the long-term continuing resolution which will provide funding until the beginning of the next fiscal year. For that reason, we must pass this 1-day continuing resolution to en-

sure that the Government continues to function while my Republican colleagues complete their work.

I hope they will be able to do so today so that the 14th continuing resolution is the last one that we will pass this year. The House needs to put the 1996 appropriations bills behind us and get started on the 1997 appropriation bills. So I urge my Republican colleagues to get our Government back on its feet and start running this place the way it should be.

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this Congress, the Republican majority claimed that this House was going to consider bills under an open process. It was going to be much more open than

the Congress before it. I would like to point out at this time, Mr. Speaker, that 92 percent of the legislation this session has been considered under a restricted process. Not only are the Republicans restricting the process on the floor, they are also restricting Members' input during the committee process.

I find it unfortunate that 72 percent of the legislation considered this session has not been reported from committee. In fact, 13 out of 18 measures brought up this session have been unreported.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following material for the RECORD.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1*	Compliance	H. Res. 6	Closed	None.
H. Res. 6	Opening Day Rules Package	H. Res. 5	Closed; contained a closed rule on H.R. 1 within the closed rule	None.
H.R. 5*	Unfunded Mandates	H. Res. 38	Restrictive; Motion adopted over Democratic objection in the Committee of the Whole to limit debate on section 4; Pre-printing gets preference.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 2*	Balanced Budget	H. Res. 44	Restrictive; only certain substitutes; PQ	2R; 4D.
H. Res. 43	Committee Hearings Scheduling	H. Res. 43 (OJ)	Restrictive; considered in House no amendments	N/A.
H.R. 101	To transfer a parcel of land to the Taos Pueblo Indians of New Mexico.	H. Res. 51	Open	N/A.
H.R. 400	To provide for the exchange of lands within Gates of the Arctic National Park Preserve.	H. Res. 52	Open	N/A.
H.R. 440	To provide for the conveyance of lands to certain individuals in Butte County, California.	H. Res. 53	Open	N/A.
H.R. 2*	Line Item Veto	H. Res. 55	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 665*	Victim Restitution Act of 1995	H. Res. 61	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 666*	Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 60	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 667*	Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995	H. Res. 63	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A.
H.R. 668*	The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act	H. Res. 69	Open; Pre-printing gets preference; Contains self-executing provision	N/A.
H.R. 728*	Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants	H. Res. 79	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 7*	National Security Revitalization Act	H. Res. 83	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference; PQ2	N/A.
H.R. 729*	Death Penalty/Habeas	N/A	Restrictive; brought up under UC with a 6 hr. time cap on amendments	N/A.
S. 2	Senate Compliance	N/A	Closed; Put on Suspension Calendar over Democratic objection	None.
H.R. 831	To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed.	H. Res. 88	Restrictive; makes in order only the Gibbons amendment; Waives all points of order; Contains self-executing provision; PQ.	1D.
H.R. 830*	The Paperwork Reduction Act	H. Res. 91	Open	N/A.
H.R. 889	Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority	H. Res. 92	Restrictive; makes in order only the Obeys substitute	1D.
H.R. 450*	Regulatory Moratorium	H. Res. 93	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 1022*	Risk Assessment	H. Res. 96	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A.
H.R. 926*	Regulatory Flexibility	H. Res. 100	Open	N/A.
H.R. 925*	Private Property Protection Act	H. Res. 101	Restrictive; 12 hr. time cap on amendments; Requires Members to pre-print their amendments in the Record prior to the bill's consideration for amendment; waives germaneness and budget act points of order as well as points of order concerning appropriating on a legislative bill against the committee substitute used as base text.	1D.
H.R. 1058*	Securities Litigation Reform Act	H. Res. 105	Restrictive; 8 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference; Makes in order the Wyden amendment and waives germaneness against it.	1D.
H.R. 988*	The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995	H. Res. 104	Restrictive; 7 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 956*	Product Liability and Legal Reform Act	H. Res. 109	Restrictive; makes in order only 15 germane amendments and denies 64 germane amendments from being considered; PQ.	8D; 7R.
H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions	H. Res. 115	Restrictive; Combines emergency H.R. 1158 & nonemergency 1159 and strikes the abortion provision; makes in order only pre-printed amendments that include offsets within the same chapter (deeper cuts in programs already cut); waives points of order against three amendments; waives cl 2 of rule XXI against the bill, cl 2, XXI and cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; waives cl 2(a) of rule XXI against the amendments in the Record; 10 hr time cap on amendments. 30 minutes debate on each amendment.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 73*	Term Limits	H. Res. 116	Restrictive; Makes in order only 4 amendments considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure and denies 21 germane amendments from being considered.	1D; 3R.
H.R. 4*	Welfare Reform	H. Res. 119	Restrictive; Makes in order only 31 perfecting amendments and two substitutes; Denies 130 germane amendments from being considered; The substitutes are to be considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure; All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5D; 26R.
H.R. 1271*	Family Privacy Act	H. Res. 125	Open	N/A.
H.R. 660*	Housing for Older Persons Act	H. Res. 126	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1215*	The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	H. Res. 129	Restrictive; Self Executes language that makes tax cuts contingent on the adoption of a balanced budget plan and strikes section 3006; Makes in order only one substitute. Waives all points of order against the bill, substitute made in order as original text and Gephardt substitute.	1D.
H.R. 483	Medicare Select Extension	H. Res. 130	Restrictive; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill; makes H.R. 1391 in order as original text; makes in order only the Dingell substitute; allows Commerce Committee to file a report on the bill at any time.	1D.
H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act	H. Res. 136	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Authorization	H. Res. 139	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act against the bill's consideration and the committee substitute; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the committee substitute.	N/A.
H.R. 961	Clean Water Act	H. Res. 140	Open; pre-printing gets preference; waives sections 302(f) and 602(b) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration; waives cl 7 of rule XVI, cl 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Makes in order Shuster substitute as first order of business.	N/A.
H.R. 535	Coming National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act	H. Res. 144	Open	N/A.
H.R. 584	Conveyance of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery to the State of Iowa.	H. Res. 145	Open	N/A.
H.R. 614	Conveyance of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility.	H. Res. 146	Open	N/A.
H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution	H. Res. 149	Restrictive; Makes in order 4 substitutes under regular order; Gephardt, Neumann/Solomon, Payne/Owens, President's Budget if printed in Record on 5/17/95; waives all points of order against substitutes and concurrent resolution; suspends application of Rule XLIX with respect to the resolution; self-executes Agriculture language; PQ.	3D; 1R.
H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act of 1995	H. Res. 155	Restrictive; Requires amendments to be printed in the Record prior to their consideration; 10 hr. time cap; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; Also waives sections 302(f), 303(a), 308(a) and 402(a) against the bill's consideration and the committee amendment in order as original text; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; amendment consideration is closed at 2:30 p.m. on May 25, 1995. Self-executes provision which removes section 2210 from the bill. This was done at the request of the Budget Committee.	N/A.
H.R. 1530	National Defense Authorization Act FY 1996	H. Res. 164	Restrictive; Makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; waives all points of order against the bill, substitute and amendments printed in the report. Gives the Chairman en bloc authority. Self-executes a provision which strikes section 807 of the bill, provides for an additional 30 min. of debate on Nunn-Lugar section; Allows Mr. Clinger to offer a modification of his amendment with the concurrence of Ms. Collins; PQ.	36R; 18D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1817	Military Construction Appropriations: FY 1996	H. Res. 167	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; 1 hr. general debate; Uses House passed budget numbers as threshold for spending amounts pending passage of Budget; PQ.	N/A.
H.R. 1854	Legislative Branch Appropriations	H. Res. 169	Restrictive; Makes in order only 11 amendments; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against the bill and cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill. All points of order are waived against the amendments; PQ.	SR; 4D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1868	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 170	Open; waives cl. 2, cl. 5(b), and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Gilman amendments as first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendments; if adopted they will be considered as original text; waives cl. 2 of rule XXI against the amendments printed in the report. Pre-printing gets priority (Hall) (Mendez) (Goss) (Smith, NJ); PQ.	N/A.
H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Appropriations	H. Res. 171	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Shuster amendment as the first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendment; if adopted it will be considered as original text. Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 79	Constitutional Amendment to Permit Congress and States to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the American Flag.	H. Res. 173	Closed; provides one hour of general debate and one motion to recommit with or without instructions; if there are instructions, the MO is debatable for 1 hr; PQ.	N/A.
H.R. 1944	Rescissions Bill	H. Res. 175	Restrictive; Provides for consideration of the bill in the House; Permits the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee to offer one amendment which is unamendable; waives all points of order against the amendment; PQ.	N/A.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1868 (2nd rule)	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 177	Restrictive; Provides for further consideration of the bill; makes in order only the four amendments printed in the rules report (20 min. each). Waives all points of order against the amendments; Prohibits intervening motions in the Committee of the Whole; Provides for an automatic rise and report following the disposition of the amendments; PQ.	N/A
H.R. 1977 "Rule Defeated"	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 185	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act and cl 2 and cl 6 of rule XXI; provides that the bill be read by title; waives all points of order against the Taubin amendment; self-executes Budget Committee amendment; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority; PQ.	N/A
H.R. 1977	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 187	Open; waives sections 302(f), 306 and 308(a) of the Budget Act; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against the Taubin amendment; provides that the bill be read by title; self-executes Budget Committee amendment and makes NEA funding subject to House passed authorization; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority; PQ.	N/A
H.R. 1976	Agriculture Appropriations	H. Res. 188	Open; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides that the bill be read by title; Makes Sreen amendment first order of business, if adopted the amendment will be considered as base text (10 min.); Pre-printing gets priority; PQ.	N/A
H.R. 1977 (3rd rule)	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 189	Restrictive; provides for the further consideration of the bill; allows only amendments pre-printed before July 14th to be considered; limits motions to rise.	N/A
H.R. 2020	Treasury Postal Appropriations	H. Res. 190	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides the bill be read by title; Pre-printing gets priority; PQ.	N/A
H.J. Res. 96	Disapproving MFN for China	H. Res. 193	Restrictive; provides for consideration in the House of H.R. 2058 (90 min.) And H.J. Res. 96 (1 hr). Waives certain provisions of the Trade Act.	N/A
H.R. 2002	Transportation Appropriations	H. Res. 194	Open; waives cl. 3 Of rule XIII and section 401 (a) of the CBA against consideration of the bill; waives cl. 6 and cl. 2 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Makes in order the Clinger/Solomon amendment waives all points of order against the amendment (Line Item Veto); provides the bill be read by title; Pre-printing gets priority; PQ. *RULE AMENDED*	N/A
H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan North Slope Oil	H. Res. 197	Open; Makes in order the Resources Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as original text; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides a Senate hook-up with S. 395.	N/A
H.R. 2076	Commerce, Justice Appropriations	H. Res. 198	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Pre-printing gets priority; provides the bill be read by title.	N/A
H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Appropriations	H. Res. 201	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Provides that the amendment in part 1 of the report is the first business, if adopted it will be considered as base text (30 min.); waives all points of order against the Klug and Davis amendments; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides that the bill be read by title.	N/A
S. 21	Termination of U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	H. Res. 204	Restrictive; 3 hours of general debate; Makes in order an amendment to be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee (1 hr); If motion to recommit has instructions it can only be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	ID.
H.R. 2126	Defense Appropriations	H. Res. 205	Open; waives cl. 2(f)(6) of rule XI and section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act against consideration of the bill; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; self-executes a strike of sections 8021 and 8024 of the bill as requested by the Budget Committee; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title.	N/A
H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	H. Res. 207	Restrictive; waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; Makes in order the Commerce Committee amendment as original text and waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act and cl. 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; Makes in order the Bliely amendment (30 min.) as the first order of business, if adopted it will be original text; makes in order only the amendments printed in the report and waives all points of order against the amendments; provides a Senate hook-up with S. 652.	2R/3D/3 Bi-partisan.
H.R. 2127	Labor/HHS Appropriations Act	H. Res. 208	Open; Provides that the first order of business will be the managers amendments (10 min.), if adopted they will be considered as base text; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against certain amendments printed in the report; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title; PQ.	N/A
H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	H. Res. 215	Open; 2 hr of gen. debate. makes in order the committee substitute as original text	N/A
H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization	H. Res. 216	Restrictive; waives sections 302(f), 308(a) and 401(b) of the Budget Act. Makes in order the committee substitute as modified by Govt. Reform amend (striking sec. 505) and an amendment striking title VII. Cl 7 of rule XVI and cl 5(a) of rule XXI are waived against the substitute. Sections 302(f) and 401(b) of the CBA are also waived against the substitute. Amendments must also be pre-printed in the Congressional record.	N/A
H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lock Box	H. Res. 218	Open; waives cl 7 of rule XVI against the committee substitute made in order as original text; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 219	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; bill will be read by title; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1617	To Consolidate and Reform Workforce Development and Literacy Programs Act (CAREERS).	H. Res. 222	Open; waives section 302(f) and 401(b) of the Budget Act against the substitute made in order as original text (H.R. 2332), cl. 5(a) of rule XXI is also waived against the substitute. provides for consideration of the managers amendment (10 min.) If adopted, it is considered as base text.	N/A
H.R. 2274	National Highway System Designation Act of 1995	H. Res. 224	Open; waives section 302(f) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; Makes H.R. 2349 in order as original text; waives section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the substitute; provides for the consideration of a managers amendment (10 min.) If adopted, it is considered as base text; Pre-printing gets priority; PQ.	N/A
H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1995	H. Res. 225	Restrictive; waives cl 2(L)(2)(B) of rule XI against consideration of the bill; makes in order H.R. 2347 as base text; waives cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; Makes Hamilton amendment the first amendment to be considered (1 hr). Makes in order only amendments printed in the report.	2R/2D
H.R. 743	The Teamwork for Employees and managers Act of 1995	H. Res. 226	Open; waives cl 2(f)(2)(b) of rule XI against consideration of the bill; makes in order the committee amendment as original text; Pre-printing get priority.	N/A
H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court for Certain Injunctions	H. Res. 227	Open; makes in order a committee amendment as original text; Pre-printing gets priority	N/A
H.R. 1601	International Space Station Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 228	Open; makes in order a committee amendment as original text; pre-printing gets priority	N/A
H.J. Res. 108	Making Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 230	Closed; Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	
H.R. 2405	Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 234	Open; self-executes a provision striking section 304(b)(3) of the bill (Commerce Committee request); Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 2259	To Disapprove Certain Sentencing Guideline Amendments	H. Res. 237	Restrictive; waives cl 2(f)(2)(B) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; makes in order the text of the Senate bill S. 1254 as original text; Makes in order only a Conyers substitute; provides a senate hook-up after adoption.	1D
H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	H. Res. 238	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; makes in order the text of H.R. 2485 as original text; waives all points of order against H.R. 2485; makes in order only an amendment offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; waives all points of order against the amendment; waives cl 5 of rule XXI (% requirement on votes raising taxes); PQ.	1D
H.R. 2492	Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill	H. Res. 239	Restrictive; provides for consideration of the bill in the House	N/A
H.R. 2491	7 Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Social Security Earnings Test Reform.	H. Res. 245	Restrictive; makes in order H.R. 2517 as original text; waives all points of order against the bill; Makes in order only H.R. 2530 as an amendment only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; waives all points of order against the amendment; waives cl 5 of rule XXI (% requirement on votes raising taxes); PQ.	1D
H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995	H. Res. 251	Closed	N/A
H.R. 2546	D.C. Appropriations FY 1996	H. Res. 252	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; Makes in order the Walsh amendment as the first order of business (10 min.); if adopted it is considered as base text; waives cl 2 and 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Bonilla, Gunderson and Hostettler amendments (30 min.); waives all points of order against the amendments; debate on any further amendments is limited to 30 min. each.	N/A
H.J. Res. 115	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 257	Closed; Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	N/A

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 2586	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Debt Limit	H. Res. 258	Restrictive; Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; self-executes 4 amendments in the rule; Solomon, Medicare Coverage of Certain Anti-Cancer Drug Treatments, Habeas Corpus Reform, Chrysler (MI); makes in order the Walker amend (40 min.) on regulatory reform.	5R
H.R. 2539	ICC Termination	H. Res. 259	Open; waives section 302(f) and section 308(a)	
H.J. Res. 115	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 261	Closed; provides for the immediate consideration of a motion by the Majority Leader or his designees to dispose of the Senate amendments (1 hr.)	N/A
H.R. 2586	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Limit on the Public Debt	H. Res. 262	Closed; provides for the immediate consideration of a motion by the Majority Leader or his designees to dispose of the Senate amendments (1 hr.)	N/A
H. Res. 250	House Gift Rule Reform	H. Res. 268	Closed; provides for consideration of the bill in the House; 30 min. of debate; makes in order the Burton amendment and the Gingrich en bloc amendment (30 min. each); waives all points of order against the amendments; Gingrich is only in order if Burton fails or is not offered.	2R
H.R. 2564	Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995	H. Res. 269	Open; waives cl. 2(i)(5) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; waives all points of order against the Istook and McIntosh amendments.	N/A
H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia Deployment	H. Res. 273	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; provides one motion to amend if offered by the Minority Leader or designee (1 hr non-amendable); motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by Minority Leader or his designee; if Minority Leader motion is not offered debate time will be extended by 1 hr.	N/A
H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform and Privatization Act of 1995	H. Res. 289	Open; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; makes in order the Transportation substitute modified by the amend in the report; Bill read by title; waives all points of order against the substitute; makes in order a managers amend as the first order of business, if adopted it is considered base text (10 min.); waives all points of order against the amendment; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act of 1995	H. Res. 287	Open; makes in order the committee substitute as original text; makes in order a managers amendment which if adopted is considered as original text (20 min.) unamendable; pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 2621	To Protect Federal Trust Funds	H. Res. 293	Closed; provides for the adoption of the Ways & Means amendment printed in the report. 1 hr. of general debate; PQ.	N/A
H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995	H. Res. 303	Open; waives cl. 2(i)(5) of rule XI and sections 302(f) and 311(a) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration. Makes in order the Resources substitute as base text and waives cl. 7 of rule XVI and sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act; makes in order a managers' amend as the first order of business, if adopted it is considered base text (10 min.)	N/A
H. Res. 304	Providing for Debate and Consideration of Three Measures Relating to U.S. Troop Deployments in Bosnia.	N/A	Closed; makes in order three resolutions: H.R. 2770 (Dorman), H. Res. 302 (Buyer), and H. Res. 306 (Gephardt); 1 hour of debate on each.	1D; 2R
H. Res. 309	Revised Budget Resolution	H. Res. 309	Closed; provides 2 hours of general debate in the House; PQ	N/A
H.R. 558	Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact Consent Act	H. Res. 313	Open; pre-printing gets priority	N/A
H.R. 2677	The National Parks and National Wildlife Refuge Systems Freedom Act of 1995.	H. Res. 323	Closed; consideration in the House; self-executes Young amendment	N/A
PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 2D SESSION				
H.R. 1643	To authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (MFN) to the products of Bulgaria.	H. Res. 334	Closed; provides to take the bill from the Speaker's table with the Senate amendment, and consider in the House the motion printed in the Rules Committee report; 1 hr. of general debate; previous question is considered as ordered. **NR; PQ.	N/A
H.J. Res. 134	Making continuing appropriations/establishing procedures making the transmission of the continuing resolution H.J. Res. 134.	H. Res. 336	Closed; provides to take from the Speaker's table H.J. Res. 134 with the Senate amendment and concur with the Senate amendment with an amendment (H. Con. Res. 131) which is self-executed in the rule. The rule provides further that the bill shall not be sent back to the Senate until the Senate agrees to the provisions of H. Con. Res. 131. **NR; PQ.	N/A
H.R. 1358	Conveyance of National Marine Fisheries Service Laboratory at Gloucester, Massachusetts.	H. Res. 338	Closed; provides to take the bill from the Speaker's table with the Senate amendment, and consider in the House the motion printed in the Rules Committee report; 1 hr. of general debate; previous question is considered as ordered. **NR; PQ.	N/A
H.R. 2924	Social Security Guarantee Act	H. Res. 355	Closed; **NR; PQ	N/A
H.R. 2854	The Agricultural Market Transition Program	H. Res. 366	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill; 2 hrs of general debate; makes in order a committee substitute as original text and waives all points of order against the substitute; makes in order only the 15 amends printed in the report and waives all points of order against the amendments; circumvents unfunded mandates law; Chairman has en bloc authority for amends in report (20 min.) on each en bloc; PQ.	5D; 9R; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 994	Regulatory Sunset & Review Act of 1995	H. Res. 368	Open rule; makes in order the Hyde substitute printed in the Record as original text; waives cl. 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; Pre-printing gets priority; vacates the House action on S. 219 and provides to take the bill from the Speaker's table and consider the Senate bill; allows Chrmn. Clinger a motion to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and insert the text of H.R. 994 as passed by the House (1 hr) debate; waives germaneness against the motion; provides if the motion is adopted that it is in order for the House to insist on its amendments and request a conference.	N/A
H.R. 3021	To Guarantee the Continuing Full Investment of Social security and Other Federal Funds in Obligations of the United States.	H. Res. 371	Closed rule; gives one motion to recommit, which if it contains instructions, may only if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee. **NR.	N/A
H.R. 3019	A Further Downpayment Toward a Balanced Budget	H. Res. 372	Restrictive; self-executes CBO language regarding contingency funds in section 2 of the rule; makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; Lowey (20 min), Istook (20 min), Crapo (20 min), Obey (1 hr); waives all points of order against the amendments; gives one motion to recommit, which if contains instructions, may only if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee. **NR.	2D/2R.
H.R. 2703	The Effective Death Penalty and Public Safety Act of 1996	H. Res. 380	Restrictive; makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; waives all points of order against the amendments; gives Judiciary Chairman en bloc authority (20 min.) on en blocs; provides a Senate hook-up with S. 735. **NR.	6D; 7R; 4 Bipartisan.
H.R. 2202	The Immigration and National Interest Act of 1995	H. Res. 384	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill and amendments in the report except for those arising under sec. 425(a) of the Budget Act (unfunded mandates); 2 hrs. of general debate on the bill; makes in order the committee substitute as base text; makes in order only the amends in the report; gives the Judiciary Chairman en bloc authority (20 min.) of debate on the en blocs; self-executes the Smith (TX) amendment re: employee verification program; PQ.	12D; 19R; 1 Bipartisan.
H.J. Res. 165	Making further continuing appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 386	Closed; provides for the consideration of the CR in the House and gives one motion to recommit which may contain instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader; the rule also waives cl. 4(b) of rule XI against the following: an omnibus appropriations bill, another CR, a bill extending the debt limit. **NR.	N/A
H.R. 125	The Gun Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act of 1996.	H. Res. 388	Closed; self-executes an amendment; provides one motion to recommit which may contain instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee. **NR.	N/A
H.R. 3136	The Contract With America Advancement Act of 1996	H. Res. 391	Closed; provides for the consideration of the bill in the House; self-executes an amendment in the Rules report; waives all points of order, except sec. 425(a)(unfunded mandates) of the CBA, against the bill's consideration; orders the PQ except 1 hr. of general debate between the Chairman and Ranking Member of Ways and Means; one Archer amendment (10 min.); one motion to recommit which may contain instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee; Provides a Senate hookup if the Senate passes S. 4 by March 30, 1996. **NR.	N/A
H.R. 3103	The Health Coverage Availability and Affordability Act of 1996	H. Res. 392	Restrictive; 2 hrs. of general debate (45 min. split by Ways and Means) (45 split by Commerce) (30 split by Economic and Educational Opportunities); self-executes H.R. 3160 as modified by the amendment in the Rules report as original text; waives all points of order, except sec. 425(a) (unfunded mandates) of the CBA; makes in order a Democratic substitute (1 hr.) waives all points of order, except sec. 425(a) (unfunded mandates) of the CBA, against the amendment; one motion to recommit which may contain instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee; waives cl. 5(c) of Rule XXI (requiring 3/5 vote on any tax increase) on votes on the bill, amendments or conference reports.	N/A
H.J. Res. 159	Tax Limitation Constitutional Amendment	H. Res. 395	Restrictive; provides for consideration of the bill in the House; 3 hrs of general debate; Makes in order H.J. Res. 169 as original text; allows for an amendment to be offered by the Minority Leader or his designee (1 hr) **NR.	ID

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 842	Truth in Budgeting Act	H. Res. 396	Open; 2 hrs. of general debate; Pre-printing gets priority	N/A
H.R. 2715	Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996	H. Res. 409	Open; Preprinting gets priority	N/A
H.R. 1675	National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1995	H. Res. 410	Open; Makes the Young amendment printed in the 4/16/96 Record in order as original text; waives cl 7 of rule XVI against the amendment; Preprinting gets priority; **NR.	N/A
H.J. Res. 175	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 411	Closed; provides for consideration of the bill in the House; one motion to recommit which, if containing instructions, may be offered by the Minority Leader or his designee. **NR.	N/A

* Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. ** All legislation 1st Session, 53% restrictive; 47% open. *** All legislation 2d Session, 92% restrictive; 8% open. **** All legislation 104th Congress, 63% restrictive; 37% open. ***** NR indicates that the legislation being considered by the House for amendment has circumvented standard procedure and was never reported from any House committee. ***** PQ Indicates that previous question was ordered on the resolution. ***** Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103d Congress. N/A means not available.

LEGISLATION IN THE 104TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

To date 13 out of 18, or 72 percent, of the bills considered under rules in the 2nd session of the 104th Congress have been considered under an irregular procedure which circumvents the standard committee procedure. They have been brought to the floor without any committee reporting them. They are as follows:

H.R. 1643—To Authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (MFN) to the products of Bulgaria.

H.J. Res. 134—Making Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996.

H.R. 1358—Conveyance of National Marine Fisheries Service Laboratory at Gloucester, Massachusetts.

H.R. 2924—The Social Security Guarantee Act.

H.R. 3021—To Guarantee the Continuing Full Investment of Social Security and Other Federal Funds in Obligations of the United States.

H.R. 3019—A Further Downpayment Toward a Balanced Budget.

H.R. 2703—The Effective Death Penalty and Public Safety Act of 1996.

H.J. Res. 165—Making Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996.

H.R. 125—The Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act of 1996.

H.R. 3136—The Contract With America Advancement Act of 1996.

H.J. Res. 159—Tax Limitation Constitutional Amendment.

H.R. 1675—National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1995.

H.J. Res. 175—Making Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time, but I reserve the balance of my time, pending my very dear friend's action on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say I have no further requests for time and I urge support of this rule. Let us move ahead. We are now down to 12 hours and 10 minutes until the Government is scheduled to shut down. We have moved ahead with this rule rapidly. Let us move ahead just as quickly with the continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, with that, I urge strong support of this rule and of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTING TECHNICAL ERRORS IN THE ENROLLMENT OF S. 735, ANTITERRORISM AND EFFECTIVE DEATH PENALTY ACT OF 1996

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 55) to correct the enrollment of the bill S. 735, to prevent and punish acts of terrorism, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADANOVICH). Is there is objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, although we do not object to the substance of this concurrent resolution, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, who could not be here because of a Committee on the Judiciary markup, would like to note the deficiencies in the process leading up to this unanimous-consent request. The ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary was not informed of the problems in this bill, nor was he included in the discussions as to how to fix this bill.

The support of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] was enlisted only after the text of the resolution was agreed to. So, in the future, if the majority seeks a unanimous-consent request, we expect the Democrats to be consulted at the beginning of the process, and not at the end.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 55

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 735) shall make the following corrections:

(a) In the table of contents of the bill, strike the item relating to section 431 and

redesignate the items relating to sections 432 through 444 as relating to sections 431 through 443 respectively.

(b) Strike section 1605(g) of title 28, United States Code, proposed to be added by section 221 of the bill, and insert the following:

“(g) LIMITATION ON DISCOVERY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) Subject to paragraph (2), if an action is filed that would otherwise be barred by section 1604, but for subsection (a)(7), the court, upon request of the Attorney General, shall stay any request, demand, or order for discovery on the United States that the Attorney General certifies would significantly interfere with a criminal investigation or prosecution, or a national security operation, related to the incident that gave rise to the cause of action, until such time as the Attorney General advises the court that such request, demand, or order will no longer so interfere.

“(B) A stay under this paragraph shall be in effect during the 12-month period beginning on the date on which the court issues the order to stay discovery. The court shall renew the order to stay discovery for additional 12-month periods upon motion by the United States if the Attorney General certifies that discovery would significantly interfere with a criminal investigation or prosecution, or a national security operation, related to the incident that gave rise to the cause of action.

“(2) SUNSET.—(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), no stay shall be granted or continued in effect under paragraph (1) after the date that is 10 years after the date on which the incident that gave rise to the cause of action occurred.

“(B) After the period referred to in subparagraph (A), the court, upon request of the Attorney General, may stay any request, demand, or order for discovery on the United States that the court finds a substantial likelihood would—

“(i) create a serious threat of death or serious bodily injury to any person;

“(ii) adversely affect the ability of the United States to work in cooperation with foreign and international law enforcement agencies in investigating violations of United States law; or

“(iii) obstruct the criminal case related to the incident that gave rise to the cause of action or undermine the potential for a conviction in such case.

“(3) EVALUATION OF EVIDENCE.—The court's evaluation of any request for a stay under this subsection filed by the Attorney General shall be conducted ex parte and in camera.

“(4) BAR ON MOTIONS TO DISMISS.—A Stay of discovery under this subsection shall constitute a bar to the granting of a motion to dismiss under rules 12(b)(6) and 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

“(5) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall prevent the United States from seeking protective orders or asserting privileges ordinarily available to the United States.”

(c) In section 620G(a), proposed to be inserted after section 620F of the foreign Assistance Act of 1961, by section 325 of the bill, strike "may" and insert "shall".

(d) In section 620H(a), proposed to be inserted after section 620G of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, by section 326 of the bill—

- (1) strike "may" and insert "shall";
- (2) strike "shall be provided"; and
- (3) insert "section" before "6(j)".

(e) In section 219, proposed to be inserted in title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act, by section 302 of the bill—

- (1) in subsection (a)(1), insert "foreign" before "terrorist organization";
- (2) in subsection (a)(2)(A)(i), strike "an" before "organization under" and insert "a foreign";

- (3) in subsection (a)(2)(C), insert "foreign" before "organization"; and
- (4) in subsection (a)(4)(B), insert "foreign" before "terrorist organization".

(f) In section 2339B(g), proposed to be added at the end of chapter 113B of title 18, United States Code, by section 303 of the bill, strike paragraph (5) and redesignate paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively.

(g) In section 2332d(a), proposed to be added to chapter 113B of title 18, United States Code, by section 321(a) of the bill—

- (1) strike "by the Secretary of State" and insert "by the Secretary of the Treasury";
- (2) strike "with the Secretary of the Treasury" and insert "with the Secretary of State"; and
- (3) add the words "the government of" after "engaged in a financial transaction with".

(h) At the end of section 321 of the bill, add the following:

"(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall become effective 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act."

(i) In sections 414(b) and 422(c) of the bill, strike "90" and insert "180".

(j) In section 40A(b), proposed to be added to chapter 3 of the Arms Export Control Act, by section 330 of the bill strike "essential" and insert "important".

(k) In section 40A(b), proposed to be added to chapter 3 of the Arms Export Control Act, by section 330 of the bill, strike "security".

(l) Strike section 431 of the bill and redesignate sections 432 through 444 as sections 431 through 443, respectively.

(m) In section 511(c) of the bill, strike "amended—" and all that follows through "(2)" and insert "amended".

(n) In section 801 of the bill, strike "subject to the concurrence of" and insert "in consultation with".

(o) In section 443, by striking subsection (d) in its entirety and inserting:

"(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall become effective no later than 60 days after the publication by the Attorney General of implementing regulations that shall be published on or before January 1, 1997."

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 411, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 175)

making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 411, House Joint Resolution 175 is modified by striking title II.

The text of the joint resolution, as modified, is as follows:

H.J. RES. 175

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 101. Public Law 104-99 is further amended by striking out "April 24, 1996" in sections 106(c), 112, 126(c), 202(c), and 214 and inserting in lieu thereof "April 25, 1996"; and that Public Law 104-92 is further amended by striking out "April 24, 1996" in section 106(c) and inserting in lieu thereof "April 25, 1996".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 175, and that I may be permitted to include extraneous and tabular material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that it will not be necessary to use anywhere near the time allotted for this measure. This is a 24-hour continuing resolution intended primarily to allow the negotiators in the conference between the House and Senate Republicans and Democrats to finalize the negotiations with the White House and Mr. Panetta, the Chief of Staff, on the omnibus wrap-up appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996.

This wrap-up bill would conclude all of the remaining as yet unsigned into law subcommittee bills, namely Commerce-Justice-State, Interior, VA-HUD, Labor-Health, and the District of Columbia. The intent would be that, because I think that we have narrowed the issues now, within the next few hours hopefully we can finalize the deliberations on all of the remaining outstanding issues of difference between the White House and both houses of Congress, and that we will indeed have a bill ready to bring to the House of Representatives tomorrow morning after going to the Committee on Rules.

That is my expectation at this point. There are still some real and meaning-

ful differences, between all the parties, between the Houses, and between the Congress and the White House, but my expectation is those differences will be resolved in a matter of hours and that we will have a final agreement to bring here to the floor. If that is not to be, then we will have other statements to make later on, but that is our plan at this point. I would hope that, frankly, everything I have said will come to pass.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this is, what, the 13th continuing resolution? Let me simply say that if this continuing resolution were for longer than 1 day, I would not support it, because it would be yet another confession of futility on the part of the Congress. But the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the distinguished chairman of the committee, is correct. We are that close to having agreement on the omnibus continuing resolution, which would finally, finally, put to bed all of the appropriation issues for the fiscal year into which we are now halfway.

Let me just say that I think Members have had a right to be concerned, because school districts are being squeezed. You still have the problem of some 40,000 title I teachers who are about to be pink-slipped if there is not a resolution of the problem.

The conferees have met ad nauseam the last 3 days, actually since Friday, and I think at this point virtually every issue seems to be resolved except the issues surrounding the environmental riders and two other issues, which I expect can be resolved.

So it is my hope that when we reconvene meetings with Mr. Panetta at 2 or 2:30 today, that we will have agreement. To do so, the White House has made clear the remaining environmental riders, which are simply causing problems, will need to be dropped, or at least reshaped in a way that allows the President to protect the public interest as he sees it.

□ 1200

And if that is accomplished, then we can bring that bill to the floor and finally finish this and move on to next year's appropriation matters.

It is my deep hope that that will, in fact, occur, but I thought it was going to happen yesterday but at 9 o'clock last night we were further apart than we were at 5 o'clock in the afternoon which I find interesting and incredible and frustrating but I guess it sometimes happens in legislative bodies.

So I simply hope that cooler heads will prevail and we will wind up with those riders being dropped so that we can bring legislation to the floor which solves the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA].

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleague for yielding time to me. When the rule was before the body to bring up this continuing resolution, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] was very lengthy and eloquent in his support of a provision that was in the resolution but was struck by adoption of the rule. That provision had to deal with the resolve for a problem we are facing with the savings and loan insurance fund, which is the SAIF fund.

It was kind of surprising to me that the gentleman from California spoke in strong support of it even though the Committee on Rules that he served on did pull it out of the product that we are ready to vote on the floor.

I would like the chairman of the committee, Mr. LIVINGSTON, to possibly yield for a question, because I am aware that he also supported this provision. Is it possible that the long-term continuing resolution that we should be seeing hopefully tomorrow would contain a fix for that very knotty problem?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLECZKA. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman it is not my intention to put that on the bill tomorrow. We have a very tough situation on a bill that has been pounded out over months and months, and, frankly, I do not think it can bear any more weight. So I would, frankly, be not inclined to put it on.

Mr. KLECZKA. Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems surprising to me that the gentleman from California, who serves on the Committee on Rules, was supporting a provision although he supported pulling it out of this resolution. If I had known that was the opinion of the chair of the committee, I surely would have tried to object to adoption of the rule, which we have just adopted in the House, and called for a roll call to see if we could not retain that in this short-term CR.

It seems it is an important issue, which I think we have to address before the end of the session, because it will just keep floating around out there. And, naturally, it is looking for a vehicle to be attached to because as a stand-alone, chances are it will not come before us.

So I am very disappointed to hear it will not be a part of the product that we will be addressing probably tomorrow. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to say that I hope that by this afternoon we will have a resolution of this long-term problem. It would be a shame if the continued existence of these legislative provisions on environmental issues would prevent us from reaching agreement on the

budget, and I hope that they are dropped so that we can proceed to give the country what it needed 6 months ago, which is completion of congressional action on all of these appropriation bills.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADANOVICH). Pursuant to House Resolution 411, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution, as modified.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 14, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—400

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Bellenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell

Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dorman
Doyle
Dreier

Duncan
Dunn
Dunbar
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gedjenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham

Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther

Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markay
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Metcalfe
Meyers
Mica
Millender
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinar
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshader
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose

Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Siskis
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tausz
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Traffant
Upton
Visclosky
Volkmeyer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—14

Barton
Becerra
Clyburn
Coble
Gibbons

Hastings (FL)
Hyde
McHale
Owens
Scarborough

Stearns
Thurman
Velazquez
Williams

NOT VOTING—18

Allard
Berman

Bryant (TX)
Coyne

Fazio
Foglietta

Johnston
Laughlin
McDade
Menendez

Oxley
Parker
Riggs
Schaefer

Schroeder
Towns
Vento
Wilson

□ 1222

Mr. STEARNS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DORNAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 129, I was unavoidably detained on other congressional business and could not be present to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 175, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be directed to make the following technical change in the engrossment of House Joint Resolution 175:

Strike the matter designating title I and section 101 and insert in lieu thereof "That".

This is a technical change. It corrects the section numbering. It has been cleared by the minority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADANOVICH). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PAPERWORK ELIMINATION ACT OF 1996

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 409 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 409

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2715) to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Paperwork Reduction Act, to minimize the burden of Federal paperwork demands upon small businesses, educational and nonprofit institutions, Federal contractors, State and local governments, and other persons through the sponsorship and use of alternative information technologies. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business. After

general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Small Business now printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 409 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2715, the Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996. This rule provides 1 hour of general debate divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business.

House Resolution 409 makes in order as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Small Business now printed in the bill. Any Member will have the opportunity to offer an amendment to the bill under the 5-minute rule. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions as is the right of the minority. Under this rule, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has had that amendment preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am pleased this bill will be considered under an open rule, which was unanimously approved by the Rules

Committee yesterday. While the chairman of the Small Business Committee testified to the Rules Committee that she did not expect many amendments, this rule will provide the entire House with sufficient time to offer amendments and express any persisting apprehension about the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have endured a brutal winter and welcome the arrival of spring. Unfortunately, our citizens still must deal with a blizzard of Federal paperwork requirements. As we approach the 21st century, the Paperwork Elimination Act recognizes the coming of non-paper-dependent information technologies, and will help reduce the avalanche of paper that has covered American taxpayers and small businesses.

I strongly supported the Paperwork Reduction Act that this Congress passed during the consideration of the Contract With America. That bill reduced the information collection burdens on the public and assured a more efficient and productive administration of information resources. Today's legislation builds upon the progress in paperwork reduction brought about by the enactment of that reform legislation.

The legislation before us today will further reduce the burden of Federal paperwork on small businesses and individuals by providing for the optional use of electronic technologies to meet the demands of Federal paperwork regulations. The American people spend billions of hours every year filling out Federal forms and submitting records to the Government, and it makes sense to allow those who have the capacity to comply with regulations by computer to take advantage of the information superhighway.

The Rules Committee heard testimony that the amount of time and effort spent by our citizens in complying with Federal regulatory paperwork represents a dollar value equal to 9 percent of the gross domestic product. The time and effort filling out paperwork would be better spent on the creation of new jobs.

I have always believed that those nations that have achieved the most impressive growth in the past have not been those with rigid Government controls, and we all know that Federal regulations and paperwork requirements are strangling job creation and productivity. Excessive Government regulatory mandates are not beneficial to economic development, and this bill enables small businesses and all taxpayers to save valuable time and money.

The Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996 has received considerable support, and I want to recognize Chairman JAN MEYERS and Representative PETER TORKILDSEN, chairman of the Small Business Committee's Government

Programs Subcommittee. Their bill effectively reduces the paperwork burden, and also benefits the environment by reducing both the need for and the disposal of paper products. They have crafted sound legislation which I be-

lieve will receive overwhelming bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2715 was favorably reported out of the Committee on Small Business by voice vote, and this rule received the unanimous support of the Rules Committee. I urge my col-

leagues to support this rule, and I look forward to a thoughtful debate on the Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following extraneous material for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

(As of April 23, 1996)

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	62	59
Modified Closed ³	49	47	26	25
Closed ⁴	9	9	17	16
Total	104	100	105	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

(As of April 23, 1996)

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	O	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 925	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: 257-155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps	PQ: 234-191 A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 217-211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 228-204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: 253-172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: 414-4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252-170 A: 255-168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	A: 233-176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 225-191 A: 233-183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 223-180 A: 245-155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232-196 A: 236-191 (6/20/95).
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 221-178 A: 217-175 (6/22/95).
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	A: voice vote (7/12/95).
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps	PQ: 258-170 A: 271-152 (6/28/95).
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 236-194 A: 234-192 (6/29/95).
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PQ: 235-193 O: 192-238 (7/12/95).
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 230-194 A: 229-195 (7/13/95).
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 242-185 A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	PQ: 232-192 A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/20/95).
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	PQ: 217-202 (7/21/95).
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/24/95).
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VAMUD Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95).
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: 230-189 (7/25/95).
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 2126	Defense Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (8/1/95).
H. Res. 207 (8/1/95)	MC	H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	A: 409-1 (7/31/95).
H. Res. 208 (8/1/95)	O	H.R. 2127	Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996	A: 255-156 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 215 (9/7/95)	O	H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	A: 323-104 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 216 (9/7/95)	MO	H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 218 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lockbox	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 219 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act	A: voice vote (9/13/95).
H. Res. 222 (9/18/95)	O	H.R. 1617	CAREERS Act	A: 414-0 (9/13/95).
H. Res. 224 (9/19/95)	O	H.R. 2274	Natl. Highway System	A: 388-2 (9/19/95).
H. Res. 225 (9/19/95)	MC	H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty & Dem. Solidarity	PQ: 241-173 A: 375-39-1 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 226 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 743	Team Act	A: 304-118 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 227 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court	A: 344-66-1 (9/27/95).
H. Res. 228 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1601	Internat'l. Space Station	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 230 (9/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 108	Continuing Resolution FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/27/95).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

(As of April 23, 1996)

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 234 (9/29/95)	O	H.R. 2405	Omnibus Science Auth	A: voice vote (10/11/95).
H. Res. 237 (10/17/95)	MC	H.R. 2259	Disapprove Sentencing Guidelines	A: voice vote (10/18/95).
H. Res. 238 (10/18/95)	MC	H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	PQ: 231-194 A: 227-192 (10/19/95).
H. Res. 239 (10/19/95)	C	H.R. 2492	Leg. Branch Approps	PQ: 235-184 A: voice vote (10/31/95).
H. Res. 245 (10/25/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 109	Social Security Earnings Reform	PQ: 228-191 A: 235-185 (10/26/95).
H. Res. 251 (10/31/95)	C	H.R. 2491	Seven-Year Balanced Budget	
H. Res. 252 (10/31/95)	MC	H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban	A: 237-190 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 257 (11/7/95)	C	H.R. 2546	D.C. Approps.	A: 241-181 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 258 (11/8/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Res. FY 1996	A: 216-210 (11/8/95).
H. Res. 259 (11/9/95)	O	H.R. 2586	Debt Limit	A: 220-200 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 261 (11/9/95)	C	H.R. 2539	ICC Termination Act	A: voice vote (11/14/95).
H. Res. 262 (11/9/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Resolution	A: 223-182 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 269 (11/15/95)	O	H.R. 2586	Increase Debt Limit	A: 220-185 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 270 (11/15/95)	C	H.R. 2564	Lobbying Reform	A: voice vote (11/16/95).
H. Res. 273 (11/16/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 122	Further Cont. Resolution	A: 229-176 (11/15/95).
H. Res. 284 (11/29/95)	O	H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia	A: 239-181 (11/17/95).
H. Res. 287 (11/30/95)	O	H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform	A: voice vote (11/30/95).
H. Res. 293 (12/7/95)	C	H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act	A: voice vote (12/6/95).
H. Res. 303 (12/13/95)	O	H.R. 2621	Protect Federal Trust Funds	PQ: 223-183 A: 228-184 (12/14/95).
H. Res. 309 (12/18/95)	C	H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands	
H. Res. 313 (12/19/95)	O	H.Con. Res. 122	Budget Res. W/President	PQ: 230-188 A: 229-189 (12/19/95).
H. Res. 323 (12/21/95)	C	H.R. 558	Texas Low-Level Radioactive	A: voice vote (12/20/95).
H. Res. 366 (2/27/96)	MC	H.R. 2677	Natl. Parks & Wildlife Refuge	Tabled (2/28/96).
H. Res. 368 (2/28/96)	O	H.R. 2854	Farm Bill	PQ: 228-182 A: 244-168 (2/28/96).
H. Res. 371 (3/6/96)	C	H.R. 994	Small Business Growth	
H. Res. 372 (3/6/96)	MC	H.R. 3021	Debt Limit Increase	A: voice vote (3/7/96).
H. Res. 380 (3/12/96)	MC	H.R. 3019	Cont. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: voice vote A: 235-175 (3/7/96).
H. Res. 384 (3/14/96)	MC	H.R. 2703	Effective Death Penalty	A: 251-157 (3/14/96).
H. Res. 386 (3/20/96)	C	H.R. 2202	Immigration	PQ: 233-152 A: voice vote (3/21/96).
H. Res. 388 (3/20/96)	C	H.J. Res. 165	Further Cont. Approps	PQ: 234-187 A: 237-183 (3/21/96).
H. Res. 391 (3/27/96)	C	H.R. 125	Gun Crime Enforcement	A: 244-166 (3/22/96).
H. Res. 392 (3/27/96)	MC	H.R. 3136	Contract w/America Advancement	PQ: 232-180 A: 232-177 (3/28/96).
H. Res. 395 (3/29/96)	MC	H.R. 3103	Health Coverage Affordability	PQ: 229-188 A: Voice Vote (3/29/96).
H. Res. 396 (3/29/96)	O	H.J. Res. 159	Tax Limitation Const. Amdmt.	PQ: 232-168 A: 234-162 (4/15/96).
H. Res. 409 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 842	Truth in Budgeting Act	A: voice vote (4/17/96).
H. Res. 410 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 2715	Paperwork Elimination Act	
H. Res. 411 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 1675	Natl. Wildlife Refuge	
		H.J. Res. 175	Further Cont. Approps. FY 1996	

Codes: O-open rule; MC-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; D-defeated; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 409 is an open rule which will allow full and fair debate on H.R. 2715, a bill to reduce the burden of Federal paperwork requirements for small businessmen and individuals.

The bill, the Paperwork Elimination Act, follows last year's enactment of the Paperwork Reduction Act. It is a continuation of Congress' efforts to reduce the demands made on our citizens as a result of Federal regulation.

As my colleague from Georgia has described, this rule provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business.

Under this rule, amendments will be allowed under the 5-minute rule, the normal amending process in the House. All Members, on both sides of the aisle, will have the opportunity to offer amendments.

This rule is an easy one for me to support. The normal committee process was followed before the bill was presented to the Rules Committee. The Small Business Committee held a public hearing to consider the bill's provisions. Then the committee held a markup, amended the bill, and reported it by voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, this is an example of the kind of rule the Rules Committee should be reporting. This is the kind of process the House should be following. I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REGULA). Pursuant to House Resolution 409 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2715.

The Chair designates the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1237

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2715) to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Paperwork Reduction Act, to minimize the burden of Federal paperwork demands upon small businesses, educational and nonprofit institutions, Federal contractors, State and local governments, and other persons through the sponsorship and use of alternative information technologies, with Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE] each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to co-sponsor and support the Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996, legislation which is sponsored by Congressman TORKILDSEN.

This legislation is a winner. Potentially, it will contribute to billions of dollars of savings in reduced regulatory compliance costs that small business and the public must pay in order to meet the Federal Governments paperwork demands. It is not only user friendly, it is also environmentally and public friendly.

I urge my colleagues vote for this bill.

Congressman TORKILDSEN is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Programs of the Small Business Committee. As a result of his work, the full committee voted unanimously on March 29 to report the bill favorably. This bill enjoys bipartisan support. The administration testified, welcomed the congressional support and attention the bill represents, and suggested an amendment which was

adopted. The Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration joined in the support. So did the small business witnesses.

We on the Small Business Committee have heard testimony that the dollar cost of Federal paperwork demands approximates \$510 billion annually. In 1992 that dollar amount estimate of the time and effort the American public spends to meet regulatory paperwork requirements equalled 9 percent of the gross domestic product. I believe that percentage would be about the same today.

Small business pays a disproportionate share of that burden. That huge figure gives you a picture of the cumulative costs. Too frequently, these costs are barriers to job creation, job preservation, and economic productivity. They are the costs of Government which are hidden taxes because the money must be paid, and it is not paid by Government spending or collected by the Internal Revenue Service.

Given the significant role small business and small business entrepreneurs play in our economy, it makes common sense to do what is possible to eliminate and reduce these costs. The Paperwork Elimination Act emphasizes the opportunity provided to reduce costs by electronic compliance with the information demands of regulatory compliance.

This bill builds on the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. We passed that legislation as part of the Contract With America last session. Every Democrat and Republican voted for that measure and the President enthusiastically signed it last May. It went into effect his past October.

The Congress established burden reduction goals for the executive branch in that act. We in the House were particularly enthusiastic that the goals be established and that we try to meet them. For the next 2 years, the goals is to reduce the overall burden of Federal paperwork requirements by 10 percent. For the following 4 years the goal becomes 5 percent each year.

There were and continue to be serious skeptics as to whether these goals can be reached. We all agree that the Federal Government should aspire and do what it can to reach them. After all, 10 percent of \$510 billion would be a hidden tax reduction of \$51 billion.

For many of us, and I think we should thank Mr. TORKILDSEN for continuing to work on this, what makes those goals reasonable is the promise of the information age we live in. New information technologies, such as the growing use of computers and modems, which even the children are learning to use, holds out the promise that the paperwork costs can be reduced. If the Government gets smarter in leading the way for the public's use of new technology, those reduction goals can be reached.

The Paperwork Elimination Act is intended to help.

It requires Federal agencies to think strategically and consider how to provide electronic options to regulatory compliance each and every time an agency comes up with a new proposal for reporting, recordkeeping, or disclosure of information.

It requires that the electronic option be considered when agencies review their continuing information demands every 3 years. And it requires the Director of OMB, through the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs [OIRA], to oversee and implement the Governmentwide adoption of the electronic option.

Lastly, it adds to the existing reporting requirement to Congress that instances of successes and failures be brought to the Congress' attention. That will enhance our oversight function and give us feedback on whether the reduction goals are being met.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill strikes a blow for a commonsense approach to regulatory and paperwork relief that all of us should support.

□ 1245

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. We share jurisdiction with that committee, and Chairman CLINGER reviewed the work that we had done on it and waived his jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my chairman.

H.R. 2715, the Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996, was originally referred to both the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and to the Small Business Committee; however, after reviewing the legislation as reported from the Small Business Committee, the Government Reform Committee waived jurisdiction to formally consider the bill.

I believe that this legislation should be considered and passed without any delay. It is good for the Government and is good for those who are required to provide information to the Government. Moreover, it does not cost money.

Mr. Chairman, this bill simply provides that the Government should take steps to allow, and even encourage, the use of electronic information technology in order to reduce the burden on individuals and businesses that disclose information to the Government. It does not require these information providers to use electronic means to supply the data; it merely permits them to do so if they have the capacity, and many do.

Enactment of this bill will simply recognize that paper copies are not the

only way to provide data to the Government. It may well be easier for citizens to transmit data electronically and it is certainly easier for the Government to receive it this way. Thus, I view this bill as a winner for all concerned.

I know of no opposition to the bill, and I urge all Members to support it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN].

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time, and I want to applaud the gentlewoman's leadership in moving this bill through the full committee and to the House floor.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us, the Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996, will require the Federal Government to get smart about the information age we live in. It requires the executive branch to become computer user friendly and allow small business and individuals the option to file all information required by the Federal Government electronically. It also requires Federal agency to make documents and publications available electronically as well.

Small business bears the disproportionate share of these reporting costs. The legislation today focuses on how the use of electronic submission, maintenance and disclosure of information demanded by the Federal Government can reduce the cost on small business. But State and local governments, government contractors, educational and nonprofit institutions, and the public at large will also benefit by the improvements in this bill.

This legislation potentially eliminates billions of dollars of cost that small business and others face in meeting Federal information demands.

I would also like to thank the bill's cosponsors for their support of this effort, as well, and also the bipartisan comments of support from the other side of the aisle. This really has been a bill that we have worked together with support from both sides of the aisle, from both the White House as well as the legislative branch, and that is why the bill is moving as quickly as it is.

Mr. Chairman, where I come from in New England, small business represents 53 percent of the private work force. Viewing our economy, small business plays an increasing role in creating new jobs as well as sustaining existing jobs. In 1993, industries dominated by small firms, from banking to tourism and everything in between, posted a net gain of over 1 million jobs, as opposed to industries dominated by large firms which lost 200,000 jobs. So clearly small business has been the engine for job growth in New England and other areas.

On the national level, the role that small business plays in the health of our economy is compelling. Small business accounts for more than three-quarters of all businesses that export. Small business contributed roughly 40 percent of the Nation's new high technology jobs during the last decade.

The health of small business is vital to our economy. The focus of the Paperwork Reduction Act is to find ways to reduce the costs of complying with government mandates by using electronic means to meet regulatory paperwork requirements. This will promote the advantages of the information age we live in, and explore the use of new information technologies and eliminate barriers to job creation caused by wasteful paperwork requirements.

Mr. Chairman, the information needs of the Federal regulatory system touch everything. Paperwork demands range from tax returns, health care reimbursement forms, and contract bids, to OSHA material data work sheets and EPA chemical reporting forms. Over and over again, there is a need, and sometimes it is very legitimate, a need for information for the Federal Government to fulfill its functions. This legislation says the Government must provide an electronic option for these demands.

The bill builds upon and complements the Paperwork Reduction Act of last year, legislation which this Congress passed unanimously. It amends that Act by specifying that small business and people with access to computers and modems should be able to use them when dealing with the Federal Government.

Again, let me emphasize this is an option for small business and individuals. It is not a requirement that they go out and computerize, although most small businesses do have at least one computer now. This is an option for them to report electronically.

I want to stress that that option is key to the bill's success. We would not be here if it were another mandate on small business. Indeed, this is an option, but one that will save small business extensive money in meeting their reporting requirements.

Also importantly, though, this bill will save money for the Federal Government, as well. Once an agency is online to receive computer-generated information, it will reduce its own cost of manually inputting information for paper reports.

Federal paperwork requirements are nothing more than hidden taxes of Government programs. The Committee on Small Business has heard testimony that these costs easily run into the hundreds of billions of dollars, and they are costs that have to be paid. They are not paid in cash to the Federal Government, but they are paid nonetheless. It is important that we reduce some of those costs through this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation importantly is also environmentally friendly, as it substitutes paper with an electronic option. You do not need the paperwork. You do not need the actual forms to file with the Federal Government. Therefore, you do not have to produce the paper. Therefore, you do not have to cut down the number of trees you would need for those reams and reams of paper.

Let me give just a little example. For example, if you are a physician, you have to file this form, this one-page form, with HCFA on average about 8,000 times per physician. Now, 8,000 times is represented by the reams of paper right here. In 1 year, one physician just filing this one form, not counting the other forms they have to file with HCFA and other agencies, would have to use this much paper just for this one form.

Instead of producing all these forms that have to be filed, for every physician to file with HCFA, that information could be filed electronically. It could be stored on something as small as this disk.

So you are saving space. You are helping the environment by not needing to produce as much paper. You are saving costs to the Federal Government as well, because they will not have to convert these handwritten forms into computer information, which is what their normal practice is. Most Federal agencies, when they receive these forms, do have someone convert them back from paper technology into computer technology. By taking out this paper mid-step, we will be able to save a great deal of cost, both for the private sector as well as for the taxpayers who have to pay the costs of that Federal agency.

Again, that is just one example out of thousands of reports that are required each and every year. In addition, there is a cost savings associated with this as well.

Filing the old-fashioned way on paper, one may find out in 6 or 8 weeks that there was a mistake. Maybe the person filling out the form left one space blank. Maybe they had the wrong serial number, some minor error. It will take 6 to 8 weeks just to receive notice that an error was made. The form has to be resubmitted.

In the meantime, your business, your operation is not receiving reimbursement for the service provided, or perhaps you are not in technical compliance with the reporting requirement, if it is a different type of form. By filing electronically, errors will be able to be spotted and corrected much more quickly, again saving time and money both for the private sector as well as for the Federal agency involved.

I think it is important to note that this is a step that will make the Federal Government friendly to the computer age; that we are saying that the

Federal Government should be doing everything it can to make use of the great advances in technology that have happened, that have been developed mostly here in America, to see that anyone trying to create jobs will not have to pay any more than is necessary to meet these requirements.

This bill, the Paperwork Elimination Act, does not replace the Paperwork Reduction Act. At the same time we want to make sure that people can file any information electronically, we still want to keep an eye on reducing the actual cost of putting that information together and make sure that no information is being requested unless it is absolutely necessary for the public good and for the Federal Government to meet its legally obligated mission.

But this bill, this legislation, will go a long way in saying the Federal Government is willing to take the steps necessary to see that a small business, whether 1 or 5 or 50 employees, to see that small business has no more cost required on it than is absolutely necessary. That savings is good for that small business, it is good for job creation, it is good for the economy in general, and it is also good for the taxpayers.

I again applaud the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], the Chair of the committee, for the great leadership she has shown on this bill and all issues dealing with small business. I again urge all my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2715, the Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996, and to commend Chairwoman MYERS for her work on this issue.

In this age of growing technology, we should encourage and offer even more opportunities for small businesses to improve productivity through technology. H.R. 2715 will make it easier for many small businesses to provide information electronically to the Government, resulting in a reduced paperwork burden.

I would caution though, this legislation is not the answer to all small business problems. As the use of information technology flourishes, a gap is growing larger between the technology haves and the have-nots.

It is true that a great many Americans send and receive electronic mail with their personal computers. Many conduct bank transactions online, from home. The Internal Revenue Service reported that at least 11 million Americans filed their Federal income taxes electronically.

But the whole truth is, the technology users I just described do not live in the lower-income communities, like mine. Most of my constituents do not have access to technology. This

means many of the small businesses in my community are quickly falling into the widening technology gap.

These businesses cannot afford to hire experts to develop software applications. They will not be taking advantage of the electronic option provided by this bill—let alone afford the expensive initial investment in computer equipment.

Although I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation—keep in mind that we need to take this bill a step further. We must continue to look for ways that will help small, disadvantaged businesses again access to information technology. If we fail to do so, we may very well lose one of the most vibrant sectors of our economy.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LOBIONDO].

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor today as a proud cosponsor of the Paperwork Elimination Act. I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN] for introducing this legislation and the gentleman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], chairwoman, for her role in bringing this to the floor.

Last year we passed the Paperwork Reduction Act. Now we are going to pass the Paperwork Elimination Act to further improve agency efficiency and responsiveness to the public. This bill recommends that our country's small businesses and Federal agencies move into the electronic information age. Some small businesses are required to file forms with up to 50 different Federal, State and local agencies.

□ 1300

This is absolutely incredible when you think about it. I believe that more of their time should be spent concentrating on providing quality goods and services to their customers. I believe this is an important piece of legislation for small businesses in my own district in southern New Jersey, as well as for small businesses around the country.

It provides small business owners with a more efficient and effective means to quickly complete agency requirements, thereby allowing them to get on with growing and improving their small businesses.

Mr. Chairman, before serving in Congress, I spent my time in a small business, in a small family business in southern New Jersey. Along with my father and my brother and some other family members, we struggled with some of the very problems that we are attempting to address today. I witnessed year after year where the requirements just seemed to grow more and more on what we were expected to provide back in the form of paperwork.

Now, as it was stated before, this will not be an answer to the entire problem,

but it is certainly a step in the right direction, because for the district that I represent in southern New Jersey that has so many small businesses that are trying to make ends meet, that are trying to do the right thing to provide jobs, this will give them an opportunity to see a small glimmer of hope.

I try, as I am sure my colleagues do, to attend as many business and Chamber meetings as I can when home on district work periods. This is something that I hear over and over again: Will you please put a human face on what you are doing in Washington and understand the implications of the decisions you make on those of us who live in the real world?

Mr. Chairman, in that real world, the paperwork requirements are a tremendous problem. It is one we are beginning to recognize today, and I am very proud that we will have the opportunity to move this forward.

So again, I am asking all my colleagues to yet again demonstrate our commitment, the commitment of this Congress, to easing the regulatory burden on American small businesses by supporting this Paperwork Elimination Act.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER].

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Paperwork Elimination Act. This legislation builds on the Paperwork Reduction Act passed by the House last year, which was one of the top recommendations of the White House Conference on Small Business held last year.

I think Members of both parties can agree that the Federal paperwork demands on small businesses and individuals have become too time-consuming, expensive, and burdensome. It is estimated that business owners and ordinary citizens spend as much as 6 billion hours per year responding to Federal reporting requirements, ranging from employment forms from the Bureau of Labor Statistics to Internal Revenue Service returns, 6 billion hours of time that could be spent generating increased economic growth or helping kids with a school project.

H.R. 2715 provides the option of electronically submitting information needed to comply with Federal regulations. Small businesses and individuals can now send and receive mail, complete financial transactions, and read magazines and newspapers from their personal computer. There is no reason why they should not have the option of completing Federal Government forms by computer. Where possible, we need to simplify and streamline Government so that interaction with Government becomes more of a positive experience rather than a chore.

As a Member of the Committee on Small Business, I urge support for this legislation in order to better enable

small businesses to compete and individuals to be productive in today's world.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the author, the ranking member, and the chairman.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Ms. DUNN].

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2715 and would like to thank the gentleman from Kansas, Chairman MEYERS, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Chairman TORKILDSEN, for their steadfast work on this legislation. The Paperwork Elimination Act is excellent legislation, and the efforts of the committee are to be commended.

This bill is a streamlining government bill, and my original intent was to offer a pro-small business friendly amendment to this legislation. After being informed, however, that the amendment would be opposed by the minority on technical grounds, I have decided to withdraw the amendment, with the intent of proposing it as part of some future legislation. I do, however, want to explain the rationale for the amendment.

Quite simply, the language I intended to offer requires that in-House agency printing of Government information be limited to certain levels so as to allow for agency convenience. Meanwhile, however, it ensures that larger non-classified jobs are outsourced to the private sector for maximum savings to the taxpayer.

Under my proposal, in-House convenience would be a limit of 1,000 units, or sheets of paper, or for a multipage document up to 5,000 sheets of paper. The current regulatory limit is 5,000 and 25,000, but clearly this limit is much too high. There is no question, for example, that a job requiring 50 reams of paper is a job a local printer can do for less than the Government Printing Office.

Mr. Chairman, so you can see that my amendment was intended to act in unison and as a complement toward the goal of H.R. 2715, which is streamlining Government.

My amendment is pro-small business. Most private printers are the mom and pop types of shops that all of us have in our own districts. If we insist that the Federal Government send its work out for a competitive bid, all of those small businesses will have an opportunity to bid on this work and drive down the cost to the taxpayer in the process.

The beauty of it is it is the small business community who would have benefited most, small businesses and the American taxpayer. Of course, with more work going to the private sector, small businesses may have the need to step up their work force to meet the increased demand, thereby making this a worker-friendly amendment as well.

My amendment is highly taxpayer friendly. The Government Printing Office has an outstanding procurement office with a proven record of purchasing printing more cheaply from the private sector than can be done by the Federal Government. The agencies are not fully availing themselves of this service, and that is the heart of this issue.

My amendment would save the taxpayers precious resources at a time when every dollar counts. This amendment is efficiency in Government. The amendment makes Government smaller by streamlining printing operations.

How many print shops do we need in the Federal Government, Mr. Chairman? Certainly not one in every Federal agency. In the President's own words from a statement dated July 22, 1994, he says "Reform legislation can improve the efficiency and cost effectiveness of Government printing by maximizing the use of the private sector printing capability through open competitive procedures and by limiting Government-owned printing resources to those necessary to maintain a minimum core capacity."

In explanation of the amendment, Mr. Chairman, we visited this issue before, and I would add under Democratic leadership. Section 207 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 1995 reaffirms congressional intent that the GPO, and the GPO only, is the sole source of procurement of printing, including duplicating, for the entire Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, as we look for ways to decrease the paperwork burden generated by the Federal Government, we must look at both the unnecessary paperwork it demands, as well as the unnecessary paperwork it does. As you might say, there are two sides to the paper, especially when the paper generated within the Federal Government is costing taxpayers millions more than they should be paying.

A preliminary CBO score of this provision which I have revised from legislation that I introduced earlier in this Congress indicates a savings to the taxpayer of around \$150 million per year. I would have hoped my colleagues might have supported my amendment on this basis, and because it is pro-small business, protaxpayer, prostreamlining Government.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the adoption of my amendment in some future legislation, and I urge the support of the Paperwork Elimination Act.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to comment that there are more than 21 million small businesses in this country, according to current estimates. In recent years, these small enterprises have employed 54 percent of the private work force, contributed 52

percent of all sales in the United States, generated 50 percent of the private gross domestic product, and in 1994, they were responsible for an estimated 62 percent of the new jobs created. Thus, the term small is rather misleading when it comes to the real impact on our economy of small business.

I think it is important that we let them do what they do best, and that is generate innovative ideas, create jobs, and stimulate the economy. That is why this bill is so important, that we release them as much as possible from the burdens of paperwork.

These paperwork demands range from tax forms, loan applications, contract bids, EPA's chemical reporting for manufacturers to OSHA's material data sheets; all of these are informational requirements. We all know what we are talking about when we are talking about paperwork reduction and elimination.

Mr. Chairman, the bill is important, and I urge the support of my colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, as America rushes forward into the information age, the Federal Government is not keeping up. Instead of using new technology to streamline the application and reporting processes that individuals, State and local governments, businesses and nonprofits must provide—the paper pile continues to grow ever higher. For those at the grassroots, time, money, and jobs are lost in the process.

The Paperwork Elimination Act serves to cut through the reams of documents—particularly those which affect small businesses, and educational, and nonprofit institutions. It will minimize their burden through the use of computer technology. As a former University president, I know how effective this act will be.

I urge a "yes" vote on the Paperwork Elimination Act. In a few days, I will introduce a measure authorizing and encouraging electronic reporting. But today's vote is a beginning in reducing and eliminating unnecessary steps in the governmental processes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2715, the Paperwork Elimination Act.

At the end of March, Mr. Chairman, this legislation was reported out of the Small Business Committee by a voice vote.

Mr. Chairman, this is a non-controversial bill. It would accomplish several much needed reforms. First, Mr. Speaker, this bill would minimize the burden of Federal paperwork demands on small businesses through the use of alternative electronic information technologies. Second, this bill would direct the Office of Management and Budget to act as the administrative body responsible for directing the Federal Government's efforts to promote and monitor the use of this new technology. Although, this would increase the administrative costs to OMB, it would not significantly impact the budget. Nor, Mr. Speaker, would it create new mandates for Federal agencies because it does not require agencies to acquire and im-

plement these new technologies. The authority to do this already exists.

Mr. Chairman, small businesses are the engine that drive our economy. They employ a large percentage of our work force and indeed, job growth in small firms is far outstripping that in large companies, which are laying off whole sections of the work force.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation will go a long way in removing the onerous paperwork burdens of small businesses, freeing them to concentrate their energies and creativity to producing higher quality products and expanding the economy.

Mr. Chairman, I commend Chairwoman MEYERS for her diligent efforts in bringing this worthwhile legislation to the House floor and I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 2715.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered by sections as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. Pursuant to the rule, each section is considered as having been read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that has been printed in the designated place in the RECORD. Those amendments will be considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Paperwork Elimination Act of 1996".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purpose of this Act is to—

(1) minimize the burden of Federal paperwork demands upon small businesses, educational and non-profit institutions, Federal contractors, State and local governments, and other persons through the sponsorship and use of alternative information technologies, including the use of electronic maintenance, submission, or disclosure of information to substitute for paper; and

(2) more effectively enable Federal agencies to achieve the purposes of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the "Paperwork Reduction Act."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 3.

The text of section 3 is as follows:

SEC. 3. AUTHORITY AND FUNCTIONS OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.

(a) DIRECTION AND OVERSIGHT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.—Section 3504(a)(1)(B)(vi)

of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(vi) the acquisition and use of information technology, including the use of alternative information technologies, such as the use of electronic submission, maintenance, or disclosure of information to substitute for paper."

(b) **PROMOTION OF USE OF ELECTRONIC INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.**—Section 3504(h) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking "and" after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting "; and", and by adding at the end the following:

"(6) specifically promote the optional use of electronic maintenance, submission, or disclosure of information where appropriate, as an alternative information technology to substitute for paper."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 3?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 4.

The text of section 4 is as follows:

SEC. 4. ASSIGNMENT OF TASKS AND DEADLINES.

Section 3505(a)(3) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking "and" after the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting "; and", and by adding at the end the following:

"(D) a description of progress in providing for the use of electronic submission, maintenance, or disclosure of information to substitute for paper, including the extent to which such progress accomplishes reduction of burden on small businesses or other persons."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 4?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 5.

The text of section 5 is as follows:

SEC. 5. FEDERAL AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) **PROVIDING FOR USE OF ELECTRONIC INFORMATION MANAGEMENT.**—Section 3506(c)(1)(B) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking "and" after the semicolon at the end of clause (ii) and by adding at the end the following:

"(iv) provides for the optional use, where appropriate, of electronic maintenance, submission, or disclosure of information; and"

(b) **PROMOTION OF ELECTRONIC INFORMATION MANAGEMENT.**—Section 3506(c)(3)(C) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking "or" after the semicolon at the end of clause (ii), by adding "or" after the semicolon at the end of clause (iii), and by adding at the end the following:

"(iv) the promotion and optional use, where appropriate, of electronic maintenance, submission, or disclosure of information."

(c) **USE OF ALTERNATIVE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES.**—Section 3506(c)(3)(J) of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(J) to the maximum extent practicable, uses alternative information technologies, including the use of electronic maintenance, submission, or disclosure of information, to reduce burden and improve data quality, agency efficiency and responsiveness to the public."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 5?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 6.

The text of section 6 is as follows:

SEC. 6. PUBLIC INFORMATION COLLECTION ACTIVITIES; SUBMISSION TO DIRECTOR; APPROVAL AND DELEGATION.

Section 3507(a)(1)(D)(ii) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking "and" after the semicolon at the end of subclause (V), by adding "and" after the semicolon at the end of subclause (VI), and by adding at the end the following:

"(VII) a description of how respondents may, if appropriate, electronically maintain, submit, or disclose information under the collection of information."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 6?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 7.

The text of section 7 is as follows:

SEC. 7. RESPONSIVENESS TO CONGRESS.

Section 3514(a)(2) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking "and" after the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (D) and inserting "; and", and by adding at the end the following:

"(E) reduced the collection of information burden on small businesses and other persons through the use of electronic maintenance, submission, or disclosure of information to substitute for paper maintenance, submission, or disclosure of information, including—

"(i) a description of instances where such substitution has added to burden; and
 "(ii) specific identification of such instances relating to the Internal Revenue Service."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 7?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 8.

The text of section 8 is as follows:

SEC. 8. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect October 1, 1997.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 8?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana) having assumed the chair, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2715) to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Paperwork Reduction Act, to minimize the burden of Federal paperwork demands upon small businesses, educational and nonprofit institutions, Federal contractors, State and local governments, and other persons through the sponsorship and use of alternative information technologies, pursuant to House Resolution 409, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1315

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No 130]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie	Cardin	Ehrlich
Ackerman	Castle	Emerson
Allard	Chabot	Engel
Andrews	Chambliss	English
Archer	Chapman	Ensign
Armey	Chenoweth	Eshoo
Bachus	Christensen	Evans
Baessler	Chrysler	Everett
Baker (CA)	Clay	Ewing
Baker (LA)	Clayton	Farr
Baldacci	Clement	Fattah
Bailenger	Clinger	Fawell
Barcia	Clyburn	Fazio
Barr	Coble	Fields (LA)
Barrett (NE)	Coburn	Filner
Barrett (WI)	Coleman	Flake
Bartlett	Collins (GA)	Flanagan
Barton	Collins (IL)	Foley
Bass	Collins (MI)	Forbes
Bateman	Combest	Ford
Becerra	Condit	Fowler
Beilenson	Conyers	Fox
Bentsen	Cooley	Frank (MA)
Bereuter	Costello	Franks (CT)
Berman	Cox	Franks (NJ)
Bevill	Coyne	Frelinghuysen
Bilbray	Cramer	Frisa
Billakis	Crane	Frost
Bishop	Crapo	Funderburk
Bliley	Cremins	Furse
Blute	Cubin	Gallely
Boehlert	Cunningham	Ganske
Boehner	Danner	Gedensson
Bonilla	Davis	Gekas
Bonior	de la Garza	Gephardt
Bono	Deal	Geren
Borski	DeFazio	Gibbons
Boucher	DeLauro	Gilchrest
Brewster	DeLay	Gillmor
Browder	Dellums	Gilman
Brown (CA)	Deutsch	Gonzalez
Brown (FL)	Diaz-Balart	Goodlatte
Brown (OH)	Dickey	Goodling
Brownback	Dingell	Gordon
Bryant (TN)	Dixon	Goss
Bryant (TX)	Doggett	Graham
Bunn	Dooley	Green (TX)
Bunning	Doollittle	Greene (UT)
Burr	Dornan	Greenwood
Burton	Doyle	Gunderson
Buyer	Dreier	Gutierrez
Callahan	Duncan	Gutknecht
Calvert	Dunn	Hall (OH)
Camp	Durbin	Hall (TX)
Campbell	Edwards	Hamilton
Canady	Ehlers	Hancock

Hansen	McDermott	Sanders
Harman	McHale	Sanford
Hastert	McHugh	Sawyer
Hastings (WA)	McInnis	Saxton
Hayes	McIntosh	Scarborough
Hayworth	McKeon	Schaefer
Hefley	McKinney	Schiff
Hefner	McNulty	Schumer
Heineman	Meehan	Scott
Herger	Meek	Seastrand
Hillery	Metcalfe	Sensenbrenner
Hilliard	Meyers	Serrano
Hinchey	Mica	Shadegg
Hobson	Millender	Shaw
Hoekstra	McDonald	Shays
Hoke	Miller (CA)	Shuster
Holden	Miller (FL)	Sisisky
Horn	Minge	Skaggs
Hostettler	Mink	Skeen
Hoyer	Moakley	Skelton
Hunter	Molinar	Slaughter
Hutchinson	Mollohan	Smith (MI)
Hyde	Montgomery	Smith (NJ)
Inglis	Moorehead	Smith (TX)
Istook	Moran	Smith (WA)
Jackson (IL)	Morella	Solomon
Jackson-Lee	Murtha	Souder
(TX)	Myers	Spence
Jacobs	Myrick	Spratt
Jefferson	Nadler	Stark
Johnson (CT)	Neal	Stearns
Johnson (SD)	Nethercutt	Stenholm
Johnson, E. B.	Neumann	Stockman
Johnson, Sam	Ney	Stokes
Johnston	Norwood	Studds
Jones	Nussle	Stump
Kanjorski	Oberstar	Stupak
Kaptur	Obey	Talent
Kelly	Oliver	Tanner
Kennedy (MA)	Ortiz	Tate
Kennedy (RI)	Orton	Tauzin
Kennelly	Owens	Taylor (MS)
Kildee	Oxley	Taylor (NC)
Kim	Packard	Tejeda
King	Pallone	Thomas
Kingston	Pastor	Thompson
Kleczka	Paxon	Thornberry
Klink	Payne (NJ)	Thornton
Klug	Payne (VA)	Thurman
Knollenberg	Pelosi	Tiahrt
Kolbe	Peterson (FL)	Torkildsen
LaFalce	Peterson (MN)	Torres
LaHood	Petri	Torricelli
Lantos	Pickett	Towns
Largent	Pombo	Traficant
Latham	Pomeroy	Upton
LaTourette	Porter	Velazquez
Lazio	Portman	Vento
Leach	Poshard	Visclosky
Levin	Pryce	Volkmer
Lewis (CA)	Quillen	Vucanovich
Lewis (GA)	Quinn	Walker
Lewis (KY)	Radanovich	Walsh
Lightfoot	Rahall	Wamp
Lincoln	Ramstad	Ward
Linder	Rangel	Waters
Lipinski	Reed	Watt (NC)
LoBiondo	Regula	Watts (OK)
Loftgren	Richardson	Waxman
Longley	Riggs	Weldon (FL)
Lowe	Rivers	Weldon (PA)
Lucas	Roberts	Weller
Luther	Roemer	White
Maloney	Rogers	Wicker
Manton	Rohrabacher	Williams
Manzullo	Ros-Lehtinen	Wise
Markey	Rose	Wolf
Martinez	Roth	Woolsey
Martini	Roukema	Wynn
Mascara	Roybal-Allard	Yates
Matsui	Royce	Young (AK)
McCarthy	Rush	Young (FL)
McCollum	Sabo	Zeliff
McCrery	Salmon	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—14

Dicks	Kasich	Parker
Fields (TX)	Laughlin	Schroeder
Foglietta	Livingston	Whitfield
Hastings (FL)	McDade	Wilson
Houghton	Menendez	

□ 1332

Mr. OWENS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2715, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas.

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1675, NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1995

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 410 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 410

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1675) to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to improve the management of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Resources now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Congressional Record on April 16, 1996 and numbered 1 pursuant to clause 6 of rule XXIII. Each section of that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final

passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BELENSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has reported an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 1675, the National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act. This is a very straightforward rule, allowing any and all germane amendments to the bill—and providing priority in recognition to those Members who have caused their amendments to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Finally, the rule makes in order a substitute amendment that was filed and printed in the RECORD on April 16 by Chairman YOUNG. The Rules Committee sent out a notice last week explaining that amendments to the bill should be drafted to this substitute.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great interest in this legislation—after all, Florida is the home of the first National Wildlife Refuge, created by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1903 and located on Pelican Island. The 14th Congressional District boasts four refuges, including the J.N. "Ding" Darling Refuge on Sanibel Island, which enjoys an international reputation for its abundant population of waterfowl and other wildlife. The legacy of "Ding" Darling—the nationally syndicated editorial cartoonist and avid sportsman—provides a good starting point for one of the debates that will take place with regard to H.R. 1675—specifically over the role of hunting, fishing, and wildlife observation in the refuge system. As a lifelong hunter and fisherman, "Ding" Darling argued for setting aside areas to protect and nurture wildlife species—such as the ducks he loved to hunt. The primary mission of these areas is to promote conservation, but he recognized that the goals of sportsmen and environmentalists were intertwined—and that indeed conservation and these sporting activities could peacefully coexist.

Some have criticized this bill for going too far in establishing hunting, fishing, and wildlife observation as purposes of the refuge system—later on today my colleague Mr. BOEHLERT and I hope to offer an amendment to clarify that this bill isn't expanding hunting on wildlife refuges—but simply recognizing that when compatible with the overall mission of conservation, hunting, fishing, and observation can and should continue to take place.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Resources Committee said in his testimony yesterday—right now there are no stated purposes for the National

Wildlife Refuge System. It's a complex system to manage, and I believe that this bill is a legitimate effort to address this problem. I would urge my

colleagues to support the rule and stay tuned to the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following information:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

(As of April 24, 1996)

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	62	59
Modified Closed ³	49	47	26	25
Closed ⁴	9	9	17	16
Total	104	100	105	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

(As of April 24, 1996)

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Defense Supplemental	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Risk Assessment	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Private Property Protection Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Securities Litigation Reform	A: voice vote (3/7/95).
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	PQ: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Appropriations	A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: 217-211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228-204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253-172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414-4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225-191; A: 233-183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223-180; A: 245-155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232-196; A: 236-191 (6/20/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 221-178; A: 217-175 (6/22/95).
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95).
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PQ: 258-170; A: 271-152 (6/28/95).
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps	PQ: 236-194; A: 234-192 (6/29/95).
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 235-193; D: 192-238 (7/12/95).
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PQ: 230-194; A: 229-195 (7/13/95).
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 242-185; A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232-192; A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFA to China	A: voice vote (7/20/95).
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 217-202 (7/21/95).
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95).
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95).
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996	A: 230-189 (7/25/95).
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: voice vote (8/1/95).
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	H.R. 2126	Defense Approps. FY 1996	A: 409-1 (7/31/95).
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	A: 255-156 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 207 (8/1/95)	MC	H.R. 2127	Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996	A: 323-104 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 208 (8/1/95)	O	H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 215 (9/7/95)	O	H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 216 (9/7/95)	MO	H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lockbox	A: voice vote (9/13/95).
H. Res. 218 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act	A: 414-0 (9/13/95).
H. Res. 219 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1617	CAREERS Act	A: 388-2 (9/19/95).
H. Res. 222 (9/18/95)	O	H.R. 2274	Natl. Highway System	PQ: 241-173; A: 375-39-1 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 224 (9/19/95)	O	H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty & Dem. Solidarity	A: 304-118 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 225 (9/19/95)	MC	H.R. 743	Team Act	A: 344-66-1 (9/27/95).
H. Res. 226 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 227 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1601	Internatl. Space Station	A: voice vote (9/27/95).
H. Res. 228 (9/21/95)	O	H.J. Res. 108	Continuing Resolution FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 230 (9/27/95)	C	H.R. 2405	Omnibus Science Auth	A: voice vote (10/11/95).
H. Res. 234 (9/29/95)	MC	H.R. 2259	Disapprove Sentencing Guidelines	A: voice vote (10/18/95).
H. Res. 237 (10/17/95)	O	H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	PQ: 231-184; A: 221-192 (10/19/95).
H. Res. 238 (10/18/95)	MC	H.R. 2492	Leg. Branch Approps	PQ: 233-184; A: voice vote (10/31/95).
H. Res. 239 (10/19/95)	C	H. Con. Res. 109	Social Security Earnings Reform	PQ: 228-191; A: 235-185 (10/26/95).
H. Res. 245 (10/25/95)	MC	H.R. 2491	Seven-Year Balanced Budget	

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

(As of April 24, 1996)

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 251 (10/31/95)	C	H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban	A: 237-190 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 252 (10/31/95)	MO	H.R. 2546	D.C. Approps.	A: 241-181 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 257 (11/7/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Res. FY 1996	A: 216-210 (11/8/95).
H. Res. 258 (11/8/95)	MC	H.R. 2586	Debt Limit	A: 220-200 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 259 (11/9/95)	O	H.R. 2539	ICC Termination Act	A: voice vote (11/14/95).
H. Res. 261 (11/9/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Resolution	A: 223-182 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 262 (11/9/95)	O	H.R. 2586	Increase Debt Limit	A: 220-185 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 269 (11/15/95)	C	H.R. 2564	Lobbying Reform	A: voice vote (11/16/95).
H. Res. 270 (11/15/95)	C	H.J. Res. 122	Further Cont. Resolution	A: 239-181 (11/17/95).
H. Res. 273 (11/16/95)	MC	H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia	A: voice vote (11/30/95).
H. Res. 284 (11/29/95)	O	H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform	A: voice vote (12/6/95).
H. Res. 287 (11/30/95)	O	H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act	PQ: 223-183 A: 228-184 (12/14/95).
H. Res. 293 (12/7/95)	C	H.R. 2621	Protect Federal Trust Funds	PQ: 230-188 A: 229-189 (12/19/95).
H. Res. 303 (12/13/95)	O	H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands	A: voice vote (12/20/95).
H. Res. 309 (12/18/95)	C	H.Con. Res. 122	Budget Res. W/President	Tabled (2/28/96).
H. Res. 313 (12/19/95)	O	H.R. 558	Texas Low-Level Radioactive	PQ: 228-182 A: 244-168 (2/28/96).
H. Res. 323 (12/21/95)	C	H.R. 2677	Natl. Parks & Wildlife Refuge	A: voice vote (3/7/96).
H. Res. 366 (2/27/96)	MC	H.R. 2854	Farm Bill	PQ: voice vote A: 235-175 (3/7/96).
H. Res. 368 (2/28/96)	O	H.R. 994	Small Business Growth	A: 251-157 (3/13/96).
H. Res. 371 (3/6/96)	C	H.R. 3021	Debt Limit Increase	PQ: 233-152 A: voice vote (3/21/96).
H. Res. 372 (3/6/96)	MC	H.R. 3019	Cont. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 234-187 A: 237-183 (3/21/96).
H. Res. 380 (3/12/96)	MC	H.R. 2703	Effective Death Penalty	A: 244-166 (3/22/96).
H. Res. 384 (3/14/96)	MC	H.R. 2202	Immigration	PQ: 232-180 A: 232-177 (3/28/96).
H. Res. 386 (3/20/96)	C	H.J. Res. 165	Further Cont. Approps	PQ: 229-186 A: Voice Vote (3/29/96).
H. Res. 388 (3/20/96)	C	H.R. 125	Gun Crime Enforcement	PQ: 232-168 A: 234-162 (4/15/96).
H. Res. 391 (3/27/96)	C	H.R. 3136	Contract w/America Advancement	A: voice vote (4/17/96).
H. Res. 392 (3/27/96)	MC	H.R. 3103	Health Coverage Affordability	A: voice vote (4/24/96).
H. Res. 395 (3/29/96)	MC	H.J. Res. 159	Tax Limitation Const. Amdmt.	
H. Res. 396 (3/29/96)	O	H.R. 842	Truth in Budgeting Act	
H. Res. 409 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 2715	Paperwork Elimination Act	
H. Res. 410 (4/23/96)	O	H.R. 1675	Natl. Wildlife Refuge	
H. Res. 411 (4/23/96)	O	H.J. Res. 175	Further Cont. Approps. FY 1996	

Codes: O=open rule; MO=modified open rule; MC=modified closed rule; C=closed rule; A=adoption vote; D=defeated; PQ=previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for yielding me the customary half hour of debate time.

Mr. Speaker, we support this rule. It is an open rule, so Members may offer any amendments that are in order under the standing House rules. Under the rule, priority in recognition for the offering of those amendments may be accorded to Members who have printed their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Although we have no objections to the rule itself, many of us believe that the legislation that it makes in order, H.R. 1675, would cause serious harm to our Nation's wildlife refuges, which provide vital habitat for hundreds of species of birds and mammals.

Since the first national wildlife refuge was established at Pelican Island, FL, in 1903, the fundamental purpose of the refuge system has been the conservation of wildlife and natural habitat. This legislation would change that by making hunting, fishing, and other recreational uses a primary purpose of the system as well.

Thus, this bill would, for the first time, direct the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to place as much importance on providing recreational opportunities in these refuges as on conserving the resources that make these opportunities possible. The Service, whose budget is already inadequate for its currently mandated responsibilities, would be required to divert its scarce funds away from protecting wildlife, to managing people and their recreational activities. That change would clearly

undermine the protection of these valuable reserves.

Recreational activities, including hunting and fishing, are permitted under existing law where such activities are appropriate. Currently, more than half of all of our refuges are open to some form of hunting; in those areas, the Fish and Wildlife Service has determined that animal populations are abundant, and hunting is compatible with wildlife protection. But hunting is not appropriate in all refuges, and therefore should not be presumed to be compatible with the purpose of the refuges, as it would be under this bill.

□ 1345

Mr. Speaker, furthermore, the bill would alter the way national wildlife refuges are established by requiring Congress to specifically authorize any refuges established using the land and water conservation fund. Only 16 of our more than 500 refuges have been specifically established by legislation, and this new requirement could delay and complicate the process of protecting imperiled wildlife. Fortunately, the House will have the opportunity to change this provision by adopting the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Another drawback of the bill is that it would allow up to 15 years to elapse between reviews of the compatibility of fish-dependent and wildlife-dependent recreational uses, whereas other uses would be required to be reviewed at least every 4 years. The long interval for reviewing hunting and fishing could result in the continuation of activities for many years that are detrimental to the conservation of wildlife.

Finally, the bill would authorize expanded military activities and other

potentially damaging Federal activities on wildlife refuges, allowing them to be exempted from the protective standards of the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act.

For all of these reasons, all the major U.S. environmental protection organizations oppose this legislation. They believe that there should be one clear overriding purpose for our wildlife refuges, and that is the conservation of wildlife and natural habitat.

Mr. Speaker, to repeat: We support this rule, which is an open rule. But we urge Members to oppose the legislation itself.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just simply say in response to my esteemed colleague and friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], that many of the concerns he has raised on the subject, in fact, will be dealt with in the amendment process, and I, too, am hopeful that we can make some further improvements in this bill through the amendment process and am prepared to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House stands in recess until 2:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2:30 p.m.

□ 1430

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McCRERY) at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE
IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 410 and rule XXIII, the Chair Declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1675.

□ 1431

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1675) to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to improve the management of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and for other purposes, with Mr. GILLMOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as the author of H.R. 1675, I am pleased that the House is considering this important legislation, which would be the first comprehensive reform of our refuge law since the enactment of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966.

I am also grateful that the author of that historic law, Congressman JOHN DINGELL, and a number of other distinguished Members including the co-chairman of the House Sportsmen's Caucus, PETE GEREN, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans, JIM SXTON, have joined with me in this bipartisan effort. Their contributions and input into this legislation have been invaluable.

Our Nation's Wildlife Refuge System, which was created by President Theodore Roosevelt more than 90 years ago,

provides both essential habitat for hundreds of species and recreational opportunities for millions of Americans. At present, the system is comprised of 508 refuges, which are located in all 50 States and the 5 U.S. Territories. These units, which cover some 91 million acres of Federal lands, range in size from the smallest of less than 1 acre to the largest, the 19.3-million-acre Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Regrettably, in recent years the public's confidence in our refuge system has been shaken by arbitrary decisions made by refuge managers; the diversion of funds to other higher profile issues; the elimination of all existing uses on newly acquired lands; lawsuits designed to prohibit certain secondary uses on a refuge; and the lack of either a vision or a comprehensive plan on how our refuge system will be managed in the future.

H.R. 1675 is the product of several years of hard work, countless meetings with various interest groups, and extended negotiations with the Departments of Interior and Defense. The bill was the subject of an extensive public hearing and was favorably reported by voice vote by both the subcommittee and the full Resources Committee, with only 5 Members filing dissenting views.

This legislation is a modest, proactive conservation measure that has been carefully refined to address most of the concerns raised by the Clinton administration.

While I will later discuss the substitute proposal in detail, it is time we had a statutory list of purposes; a definition of what is a compatible use; allow existing wildlife-dependent recreational uses to continue on new refuge lands unless they are found to be incompatible; a conservation plan for each refuge; and clarification that fishing and hunting should be permitted unless a finding is made that these activities are inconsistent with sound fish and wildlife management, the purpose of the refuge, or public safety.

Furthermore, it will strengthen the management of the refuge system and it implements a better, more uniform system-wide planning and compatibility review process. This had been a goal of the environmental community for some time.

While H.R. 1675 does not attempt to solve all of the problems facing our refuges, it will ensure that the system is effectively managed, that essential habitats are protected, and that the American people have an opportunity to fully utilize those Federal lands that are paid for with their tax dollars, their entrance fees, and from purchases of duck stamps.

This is a sound piece of legislation. It is supported by many groups, including the American Sportfishing Association, the California Waterfowl Association, the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus,

the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, the New Jersey Federation of Sportsmen, the National Rifle Association, and the Wildlife Legislative Fund of America. This bill will ensure that our refuge system has the support of the American people into the 21st century.

Finally, a word of caution. I know there are Members who would like to see H.R. 1675 become a vehicle to solve a whole range of problems in individual units, including mosquito abatement, public health, and additions or deletions of land from existing refuges. While these changes may have merit, I would hope they would not be offered to this measure but instead the sponsors would allow the Resources Committee to fully review them.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time I intend to engage in a colloquy with the co-author of this bill, JOHN DINGELL, on the issues of open until closed refuge lands and water rights. I am confident that this clarification and the substitute will remove most, if not all, of the confusion about the scope of this measure.

It will also restore the fundamental goals of H.R. 1675, which are to conserve, manage, and recover wildlife and to ensure that Americans have an opportunity to participate in compatible wildlife-dependent recreation.

I urge the adoption of H.R. 1675.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would certainly support improvement of the National Wildlife Refuge System if it really needed it, but it does not.

Much of the momentum behind this bill has been generated by sporting groups that seek to elevate the role of hunting and fishing off our National Wildlife Refuges. Now, the plain truth is that hunting and fishing are already allowed on more than half of the 508 wildlife refuges and on more than 94 percent of the 92 million acres of the System. I respectfully submit that is a lot of hunting and fishing.

Moreover, President Clinton, far from closing refuges to hunting and fishing, on March 25 issued an Executive order reaffirming the administration's commitment to a diversity of recreation of refuge lands so long as it is compatible with the longstanding primary purpose of the Refuge System—fish and wildlife conservation.

Some were fearful that the administration's settlement of a lawsuit regarding the compatibility of secondary uses of the refuges would result in restrictions on sporting activities. After reviewing more than 1,000 activities throughout the System, not one wildlife refuge was closed to hunting.

In fact, the Clinton administration has opened more refuges to hunting

and fishing in its first 2 years than did the Bush administration during its last 2 years.

So, this legislation attempts to fix a problem that does not exist. And along the way, it actually undermines the ability of the wildlife management professionals of the Fish and Wildlife Service, with whom the job is properly left, to manage the many competing public uses of the National Wildlife Refuge System. This bill is not an improvement. It is bad for the wildlife, and that is ultimately bad for the sportsmen and sportswomen whose activities depend on abundant wildlife populations.

In addition, the bill contains provisions which will create overly broad exemptions for military activities on wildlife refuges, and strip refuges of reserved water rights.

The substitute before the House fortunately drops a provision included by the Resources Committee to allow harmful pesticides to be used on refuges lands leased by farmers. That is a positive step, although the same provisions were contained in the long-term CR recently passed by the House and Senate. There were some other changes made that were mostly cosmetic and do not address the fundamental problems with the bill.

I am also aware that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] will offer en bloc amendments to the bill. While I applaud the gentleman's efforts to improve the bill, these amendments do not do the trick either.

No, the problems with this bill are much more fundamental. As Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt said to Chairman YOUNG in an April 23 letter concerning this bill: "This bill is not the right way to celebrate Earth Week or the environment."

The President has addressed the legitimate concerns about hunting and fishing in our refuges. There is an appropriate balance between wildlife conservation and public recreation. That balance already exists in our National Wildlife Refuge System. This bill will upset that delicate balance. I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1675.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the statement of administration policy on H.R. 1675.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

(This statement has been coordinated by OMB with the concerned agencies.)

H.R. 1675—NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE IMPROVEMENT ACT (REP. YOUNG (R) AK AND 27 COSPONSORS)

If H.R. 1675, as reported by the Rules Committee (the Young substitute amendment), is presented to the President in its current form, the Secretary of the Interior will recommend that he veto the bill.

H.R. 1675, as reported by Rules Committee (the Young substitute amendment), would greatly weaken the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's ability to protect the National Wildlife Refuge System from harmful activities. The Young substitute amendment does

not address many of the bill's fundamental problem and creates significant new problems by:

Eliminating consideration of the "public interest" in opening wildlife refuges to recreational interests.

Establishing an unneeded exemption process to facilitate expanded military use of refuge lands, despite no showing that military needs are not currently being accommodated.

Calling into question the validity of existing reserved water rights of individual refuges and thus undermining the ability of the Service to provide suitable habitat for the species on such refuges.

Allowing some present and future refuges to be transferred to the States as "coordination areas" to be managed free from the provisions of refuge law.

Restricting the needed expansion of the System by imposing new limits on the use of the Land and Water Conservation Fund monies for refuge acquisition.

Elevating certain public uses of refuges, including hunting and trapping, into purposes of the System.

Compromising the process for determining whether certain recreational uses are compatible with refuge purposes and should be allowed at any given refuge.

Waiving refuge law to allow the dumping of chemicals into aquatic habitats on refuges in order to kill certain nuisance species.

□ 1445

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, some opponents of this bill would like everyone to believe that its only purpose is to permit fishing and hunting in our National Wildlife Refuge System. This is simply not true. This is a comprehensive bill that will improve and enhance wildlife management of the national wildlife refuges throughout our entire country.

This bill addresses a broad range of concerns expressed in a variety of Government reports going back 25 years about the need for better, more uniform system-wide management of refuges. For the first time, this bill establishes a system-wide mission statement. Those purposes include not only compatible fish and wildlife oriented recreation, including fishing and hunting, it also includes wildlife observation and environmental education and also conservation management, restoration of fish and wildlife, the preservation of endangered species and the implementation of the international treaty obligations regarding fish and wildlife.

Those are a broad-ranging set of objectives that this reform bill has inherent within it. The bill also gives the Secretary of the Interior comprehensive direction on the administration of the system and establishes a management planning process that will be uniform throughout the system, something that has been sorely needed in my opinion for many years.

It assures public involvement in the planning process and requires that those plans be reviewed at least every 15 years. One aspect of the bill that I believe is critically important is the requirement that refuges remain open until closed. Let me explain why I believe this section of the law is critically important.

Under the system which currently exists, as refuges expand or as new refuges are created, the minute the Fish and Wildlife Service or the Federal Government takes title to land, it is closed to all wildlife-related public uses. I do not believe that it is anyone's intent that that happen.

We changed the provisions so that, when the Fish and Wildlife Service assumes title and assumes, therefore, the management of new lands, that these historic wildlife-related uses continue to occur until a management plan is adopted. This is a very important change because in some areas of the country, the refuge system, which at one time enjoyed almost unanimous public support, today the system does not enjoy and the plans do not enjoy unanimous public support because the minute someone, the minute the refuge system acquires additional land, it is closed to hunting and fishing and bird watching and any other use that is related to wildlife pursuits. So this bill, I believe, is important for that reason and it should be considered, I think, one of the very important provisions.

This bill also codifies the existing regulatory definition of "compatible use" that the Fish and Wildlife Service has obviously used for many years. The committee expects that there will be some wildlife refuges, particularly in urban areas, that will not be appropriate settings for all forms of wildlife-dependent recreation. Therefore, there is no reason to believe that this measure will greatly change the current management system.

Finally, this bill establishes a broad goal of wildlife protection for our refuge system, establishes purposes that reflect the current goals of the system, institutes a long overdue systemwide comprehensive planning process, and assures that taxpayers who purchase the refuge lands can utilize them in many legitimate ways.

This bill merits your support, and I obviously think that everyone should vote for it. I would just conclude, Mr. Chairman, by mentioning that there are a broad, a large number, a broad array of organizations that support this bill. For example, let me just read some of them, the American Sportfishing Association, the California Waterfowl Association, Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, Foundation for North American Wild Sheep, the International Association of Fish

and Wildlife Agencies, the Mzuri Wildlife Foundation, the National Wild Turkey Federation, the New Jersey Federation of Sportsmen, the North American Waterfowl Federation, Quail Unlimited, the Ruffed Grouse Society, Safari Club International, Wildlife Forever, and the Wildlife Legislative Fund of America.

Mr. Chairman, I think that these organizations know that this is a good bill. I believe it is a good bill. I incidentally think it will even be enhanced by the Boehlert amendment when it is offered. I urge everyone to support the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from California mentioned the fact that there was a statement from the administration opposing my bill. I am amazed. I cannot believe that, because four of the things that they are opposing my bill on, two of them were their language.

One was on establishing an unneeded exemption process to facilitate expanded military use of refuge lands, despite no showing that military needs are not currently being accommodated. That is their language.

The other one is calling into question the validity of existing reserved water rights. We did not even talk about water rights. Then we have two of them that they are objecting to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] is going to solve in his amendment, and we agreed to accept that amendment. Of course, the one thing that bothers me the most is that they are opposed to hunting. They are also opposed to fishing. By Executive order the President says, no, I am all for this, but it is by Executive order. What we are trying to do is revive and establish what refuges were set up for and by whom and who supports them.

All the refuges that I have served under in 24 years were created with the full support of the fishermen and the hunters and the recreation users. Now we are having managers say, no, you cannot fish in Arkansas, because we believe that the way you fish is wrong so fishing is closed. This is by a manager. I talked to Mollie Beattie. She says I cannot override the manager's position.

Then we have a case in Oklahoma where a manager, this refuge was created for migratory waterfowl and they managed it for migratory waterfowl by planting crops that would be something for the geese and the ducks as they flew down the byway to eat. The manager said, no, this is not natural. We will not plant this food so they can eat. And around the refuge the farmers were still farming so all the ducks and geese went to the farms outside the refuge so there is no longer any birds in the refuge. This is all documented.

But now the same manager says, oh, by the way, fishing is prohibited on

this refuge because it might interfere with the waterfowl. Wait a minute. Where are the waterfowl? Off the refuge because they stopped growing feed. So the fishermen are terribly upset. The hunters are upset. The birds are upset. And the refuge has no support. And when the people stop supporting refuges, there will be no more refuges, nor the existence will not be funded.

I am asking for passage of this legislation so that the sportsmen of America, the little child that has a cane pole, the person in the wheelchair that goes out on the dock and tries to catch a fish has an opportunity to do so and not letting one person arbitrarily say, no, you cannot do it because I do not think it is compatible.

All this bill does is set a criteria and allows uses, as long as they are compatible, to take place. And it takes away the discretion of a manager to arbitrarily impose his philosophy upon a refuge that was created for other reasons.

If he decides to try to do that, he has to justify and prove that it is not compatible. If it endangers the public, yes; if it endangers a species, yes; if it in fact does some harm, he has that latitude. But if there is not a reason, then he cannot disallow it.

So this is what this bill is all about. It is unfortunate that this administration for some reason is against the American sportsmen. They do not support the American sportsmen and do not let anyone say they do just because the President goes on to an area to shoot 1 duck, and by the way he missed 42. He might be called a conservationist. Do not let the American sportsmen be fooled by this position.

What they want is to eliminate what the original refuges were set up for, the purposes of them. And in fact, they do not recognize the danger of not having the support by those people.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN].

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1675. I want to congratulate Chairman YOUNG and Mr. DINGELL for putting together a bipartisan piece of legislation. Additionally, I am encouraged that this is a clean bill and one that recognizes all the traditional recreational uses of our refuges as purposes.

The original principal behind the establishment of our wildlife refuges was to ensure the viability and health of wildlife populations. H.R. 1675 recognizes this principal by adopting five purposes: First, conserve and manage fish, wildlife, plants and their habitats; second, preserve, restore and recover endangered or threatened species; third, fulfill international treaty obligations; fourth, conserve and manage

migratory birds, anadromous fish, and mammals; and fifth, provide opportunities for compatible wildlife-dependent recreation, including hunting, fishing, wildlife observation, and environmental education. Each refuge may adopt all the stated purposes or select just a few, depending on the compatibility of the purpose to the refuge. Under the bill, each purpose must be compatible with the underlying principal of protecting the health of wildlife populations in order to be a purpose at a specific refuge. Under this legislation, the underlying principal will not be compromised.

Some of my colleagues may have concerns because hunting is listed as a purpose of wildlife refuges. First of all, hunting is recognized by the general wildlife science community as a valid wildlife management tool if done in a proper manner. Second, if the refuge manager or the Secretary finds that hunting is not compatible with a certain refuge, hunting will not be allowed. The reason we have put this language into this bill is to avoid the situation we were faced with a few years ago where hunters were put on notice that they may lose their hunting rights on lands they have always hunted on. Hunters are avid users of refuges—billions of their dollars have gone to wildlife and habitat conservation through excise taxes, licenses, and stamps. It has been estimated that over three-fourths of the lands acquired for the refuge system were purchased through migratory bird conservation dollars through the sale of duck stamps.

As an example, in the 1st District of Arkansas, land was acquired to enlarge the Cache River Refuge. These lands were used for hunting for decades before they were added to the refuge system. It is the ultimate slap in the face to these hunters that they may lose the opportunity to hunt on land they have hunted on for generations and that the land was purchased with their dollars.

Many changes have been made to this bill to address the administration's concerns and I believe that the final bill is a good product. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1675.

□ 1500

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support, as the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN], and I know the gentlewoman is set with twins and that she would be participating in the Sportsmen Caucus, Republican versus Democrat, shootoff on May 6, but I do not think her doctor would let her do that.

Mrs. LINCOLN. That is right; the gentleman is lucky I am not.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. But she would be there, I understand, and I speak as one

of the new cochairmen for the Sportsmen Caucus along with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER], and the Sportsmen Caucus is founded to support the rights of fishermen and families that are interested not only in conservation, in the environment as far as fishing and hunting and a national treasure that we have enjoyed over a lifetime.

This is a pro-environment bill, although there will be some that say it is not, and I think what we need in this body is more of a middle-of-the-road kind of direction instead of those that want to pave over the world, like those groups like Earth First, Earth Island, in which the Unabomber's manifesto was drafted and the extremist groups and special-interest groups on both sides, and I think that this bill tries to come somewhat in the middle.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to my colleagues that there is a very good Jewish proverb that was born out of the movie called "Jazz Singer," and I am old enough, like the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], the chairman, to remember a guy named Al Jolson, and later Neil Diamond played in a movie, and it is about a father who has lost his son, not to a death but because of an argument, and the Jewish proverb goes like this:

The father says, "Son come home. We have argued too long."

And the son replies, "Father, I cannot. There has been too much between us."

And the father's reply to his son is, "Son, come as far as you can, and I will come the rest of the way."

I think this bill comes the rest of the way and meets somewhere in the middle, and we would ask our colleagues from both sides of the aisle to make that distance in between because that is the intent.

We are trying to protect a long history of the ability of people to use recreational areas, to hunt to fish, to look at birds, to preserve the environment and conserve. And if you take a look at those groups like Sportsmen Caucus, those are the groups that have provided, for example, the duck and the wetlands up in Canada. The species would be almost totally eliminated if they had not purchased the land that will allow the nesting of our migratory birds. And all of those efforts have come about from the Sportsmen Caucus-type groups and have actually enhanced our environment.

The environmental groups opposing this will claim that unlimited hunting and fishing will occur on all refuges. This is not true. This is not the case. The bill provides the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with the option to disallow hunting on refuges if it is decided that these activities pose a threat to public safety or conservation purposes of the refuge.

What it does do: It eliminates an individual with a certain agenda at the

head of each of these refuges from making an arbitrary decision to just cut off recreational use, and we think that this is wrong. I believe that that is median policy and, I think, can be supported, and I think will be supported, just like the gentleman from Arkansas and my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER]. It establishes conservation plans for each of the 504 refuges within 15 years.

Mr. Chairman, the bill is the first significant refuge reform bill considered by Congress since 1966. I would ask my colleagues to support it.

I look back when I grew up. I lost my dad about a year and a half ago, but I can still remember as a youngster going to Swan Lake in Missouri and hunting with my dad and fishing. I can remember just recently going over with my dad to the Imperial Valley at Wooster and doing the same thing, and I got some duck mud between the toes of both of my daughters, and I would like to be able to continue that because I think that communication between father and son and father and daughter and grandfather, which also takes some hunting, is very important to the tradition of this country.

I thank the chairman for sponsoring the bill and supporting it, and I ask an "aye" vote on it.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I came down mostly because I wanted to be able to say for the only time in the 9 years I have been in Congress that I think that the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] are right in their joint effort in legislation, and I intend to support them. I will probably never have an opportunity to utter that sentence again, the reason being the context here and one that has been overlooked in the course of the previous discussion, which has been more of a discussion than a debate because of the wide range of support behind this legislation.

But the fact that since 1966 we have had no review of the means by which we make conservation and comprehensive planning is in and of itself somewhat disgraceful.

Imagine if our foreign policy were conducted by diplomats who were basing their 1996 on their 1966 views. Imagine if we had economists who were sitting there projecting the manner in which they have projected 30 years ago. The answer is through everything from propagation programs that have been able to save some endangered species. In my own State of Louisiana, believe me, what was the endangered alligator species is now a fulfillment of what was a common expression that "you are up to your you know what in alligators." That is now both literally and figuratively true because of efforts made in

wildlife refuges and accomplished in Cameron and Vermilion Parish.

The second thing is, as my colleagues know, nature does not adhere to legislation even, regulations. That would probably astonish some bureaucrats to believe there is a force higher than they are, but nature itself sometimes does things like hurricanes, reroutes canals, uproots trees, moves levees. If we do not have comprehensive planning that also is revisited and adjusted, then we are going to do great untold harm to neighboring communities, to fish, to wildlife, and all the public.

So for that reason I think you see such a wide array of those of us who serve in the House and who may disagree on how to get to some end results supporting the same vehicle here today, and it is truly unfortunate that the Secretary of the Interior does not reflect that same wide range and broad-based support.

I would hope that he would read the bill. I would hope that he would indeed urge the President to sign the bill rather than urge him to veto it. For that reason he would do untold good to not only those who are here today voting but to the future generations of all Americans.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] for his kindness in yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] for his kindness in granting me this time.

I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], my good friend, the chairman of the committee, with whom I have worked very hard on this legislation.

I would like the House to know that this is good legislation, and I would like to tell them a little bit as to why.

In my young days between about 1966 and about 1974, I was chairman of a little subcommittee called the subcommittee on fisheries and wildlife conservation. It was one of the components of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It had jurisdiction overall of the national refuge system. And during that time we wrote the National Wildlife Refuge System Act of 1966.

Since that time I have also served for 26 years as a Democratic Representative of the House to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, which is in charge of buying land for the migratory bird refuge system, and in that time the Nation has acquired over 600,000 acres of habitat for the protection of migratory birds and other wildlife. This is a great treasure and one of my principal purposes has been to protect it to assure that it would not be destroyed or dissipated. Indeed one of

the early things which we confronted was an attempt by the then-Secretary of the Interior McKay to dissipate the entirety of the refuge system. That was brought to a halt, and, as a result of that, the Refuge Administration Act was put together. This legislation has been called the best piece of public land management legislation ever.

Some 30 years now after that was done, I am proud to see the accomplishments which have taken place as a result of that bill. The system is now providing well-managed habitat for the protection of resident and migratory species. It is also helping to recover threatened and endangered species. It is contributing to the diversity of refuge areas, and it is serving for all of the people much more traditional and wildlife-related purposes, such as hunting, fishing, and wildlife observation.

It is a system which, I would remind my colleagues, is funded in the largest part by the contributions of the hunters of this Nation who, by their purchase of duck stamps, make it possible for this Nation to acquire the lands which are set aside forever as a part of the refuge system. It is important to recognize then the unequal part that our Nation's hunters and fishermen pay—play in providing constant support for the expansion and the maintenance of our refuge system.

America's sportsmen and sports women provide this help not only with their votes but also through the purchase of duck stamps, a substantial portion of the public dollars then which are expended in support of the refuge system.

A few weeks ago the President expressed his support of the sportsmen community by issue of executive order. It recognizes supporting uses as a priority use of the system, and this is one of the reasons that we are able to sustain that system and to encourage patriotic sportsmen, hunters, outdoors men and women for contributing to the system.

Now, I have hunted with the President, and I know of his strong interest in our refuge systems, and I am pleased that he took the initiative with this executive order. It is my hope that he will see the merits of the legislation here which codifies much of that order.

H.R. 1675 is the result of some long-sought legislative improvements in the refuge system. For many years, environmentalists and sportsmen and women have called for an organic act which lays out clear purposes of the system and requires the completion of the conservation management plans for each refuge. A number of studies by the General Accounting Office and the Fish and Wildlife Service have found many problems in our refuges. These problems range from overuse to toxic contamination to a lack of proper funding and proper management. H.R. 1675 is the result of thorough examination of

these problems and an attempt to make improvements of the management of the system which will require better planning, compatible uses, and a clear identification of the purposes of the system.

Chairman YOUNG last year talked to me about cosponsoring this legislation. I agreed to do so so that this body could give the Fish and Wildlife Service the tools that it needs to do the job.

□ 1515

In fact, I decided to cosponsor this bill only after consulting with the Fish and Wildlife Service and being convinced that the bill is in the best interest of the National Wildlife Refuge System and the wildlife that it protects.

I want to commend again the distinguished gentleman from Alaska for his leadership in this. This is a good bill. It is one which will make progress in terms of protecting the refuge system and one which will make real progress in terms of protecting the wildlife that are dependent upon it, and in assuring that we can continue the public support which has made possible the success of one of the greatest systems of public lands and the greatest systems of public land management for an important national purpose, and that is the protection of wildlife.

There is no doubt that this bill has, I would observe, some reservations. I have worked for several months with the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Interior Department, the Council on Environmental Quality, and other organizations to address problems that they have brought to my attention. I would observe that in each instance my good friend from Alaska has been most helpful in addressing those concerns.

Now, one major source of concern is the question of hunting and wildlife-dependent recreation on the system. Well, first of all, under this legislation no hunting and no refuge use can take place which is inconsistent with the purposes for which this system is set up.

Remember, this system is set up and paid for in good part by the hunters of America who contribute to this. I would observe that the critics of this bill have probably in toto contributed nothing to the purchase of refuge system lands over the years. I think that tells us a great deal, that people who love it enough to put their money where their mouth is are the hunters and the sportsmen. They will use this, and they will use it in a fashion which is consistent with the purpose of the refuge and in a fashion which is consistent with the best interests of not only the habitat but also the wildlife.

I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation, to understand that basic good sense and basic hunting, not only as a purpose of the refuge but also as a device for the manage-

ment of the wildlife there, makes the best of good sense. This is a good piece of legislation. I urge my colleagues to support it. I tell the Members, both as a hunter and a conservationist and as one who has authored much of the legislation that relates not only to the refuge system but protection of the environment, that this is good legislation. I urge my colleagues strongly to support it. It is in the public interest, it is in the interest of the refuge system, it is in the interest of the wildlife, and future generations will thank us for passing this legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] has 9 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has 15 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I think that whenever the U.S. Congress passes legislation, they should keep several important things in mind which I am going to describe. I think those things that enhance legislation in this House, which enhance laws, are present in this legislation.

First of all, I think with the amendments by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], this legislation will improve existing law.

No. 2, this legislation provides a structure which will enhance local managers' ability to work much more closely with the State government, with the local government, with private landowners, with environmental groups, with anybody that has any kind of an interest in America's wildlife refuges.

No. 3, this particular legislation continues to give local managers the flexibility they need to provide what they feel is necessary to manage wildlife in any way that they think is conducive for their conservation.

I want to make a comment to an earlier statement by the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM described the story where a father and son had a falling out, and the father called the son and said, "Let's get together." The son said, "I can't, there is too much between us." Then Mr. CUNNINGHAM said the father told the son, "Just come as far as you can go, and I will go the rest of the way."

If we want to legislate good laws for this country, then this particular piece of legislation, I might add to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], this particular piece of legislation brings opposing forces together. Each side has come just as far as they can go and there has been a compromise.

If we are going to be successful in managing the Nation's resources, then

this type of discussion, this type of debate, this type of legislation is the kind of example that we need to show to our constituents and we need to show to our Nation. So I would urge the Members that this is a good bill. We should vote for this bill.

I want to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Resources for his work.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1675, the National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act. This bill clarifies the original intent of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966.

That intention being: wildlife based recreation, including hunting and fishing, being a primary purpose of the system.

As many of you know I am an avid and responsible sportsman. This legislation erases 30 years of over zealous regulation by the Fish and Wildlife Service. It is high time we give back the refuge system to the people—not to the Government.

It is becoming harder and harder for individuals to enjoy the sports of hunting and fishing. Most people don't have the ability to own private land for these activities.

H.R. 1675 brings wildlife-dependent recreation back as one of the primary goals of the refuge system.

Our refuge system is in dire need of reform, and this is the vehicle in which it can be accomplished.

H.R. 1675 has bipartisan support including wildlife conservation groups, and State fish and wildlife agencies.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1675.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry. Just for the sake of a clarification so I know whether I can yield back or not, can the Chair advise me with respect to the Nadler amendment? Must that be offered prior to?

The CHAIRMAN. The Nadler amendment was printed in the RECORD. Prior to what?

Mr. MILLER of California. The question is, is that impacted by the Boehlert amendment? I do not know if the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] is going to offer his amendment now.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] will be offering his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] was not printed in the RECORD. The amendment of the gentleman from New York, Mr. NADLER, was printed in the RECORD, and

under the rule, Mr. NADLER could have priority of recognition.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman from Alaska sing for 5 minutes? We are looking for the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER]. I think I need to protect his rights to offer his amendment. Maybe the gentlewoman from Arkansas can offer her amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. If the gentleman from California will yield back the balance of his time.

Mr. MILLER of California. That is what I am trying to determine.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield back the balance of my time. I will have the gentlewoman's amendment made in order right off the bat.

Mr. MILLER of California. Then we will do the Nadler amendment and the Boehlert amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Whatever is right, I will do hers.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the Chair for indulging our concerns. The gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] is here.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening to stand together with my colleagues in commemoration of the Armenian genocide of 1915–23. Eighty-one years ago, while Europe was embroiled in war and the Ottoman Empire was crumbling, a concerted campaign to eradicate the Armenian people began. In the course of 8 brutal years, at least 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children were massacred.

What was the reason behind this deliberate and calculated effort to destroy an Armenian presence in Turkey? We will probably never know. The official Turkish Government position is that, during World War I, a series of internal conflicts contributed to the unfortunate deaths of many Armenians. In my opinion, that symbolizes a categorical denial of what really happened. It is the denial of an event that has been documented by scholars the world over. That denial is disrespectful to the memories of those that perished, those that survived, and to the civilized world. Quite simply, it is reprehensible. As a Jewish Member of Congress, and a human being, I cannot stand idly by while this denial continues to be perpetrated.

It has been said that when Adolf Hitler was planning the Final Solution to the Jewish problem, he recalled the international reaction to the Armenian genocide: "Who remembers the Armenians?" he offered. In the same vein, who then would stand up for the Jews and remember them? Well, we do remember that Holocaust, as well as the innocent victims of the Armenian genocide, and we will continue doing so, that it may never happen again.

The Armenian genocide was the first of the 20th century, but because the world did not learn its lesson, we were forced to endure the horrors of the Jewish Holocaust. Therefore, we have pledged, and stand together, as Jews, as Armenians, as people, that we will never allow this kind of tragedy to befall us again.

I thank my colleagues, Congressmen JOHN PORTER and FRANK PALLONE, for leading this

effort in the House of Representatives, and am proud to be a member of the Armenian Issues Caucus in order to work on this issue of concern to all human beings.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for the amendment offered by my colleague from New York, Mr. NADLER. I strongly agree that we must eliminate the provisions of this legislation that would require specific congressional authorization for the creation of new national wildlife refuges.

It is clearly the case that Congress ought to be involved in decisions about the creation of wildlife refuges. In fact, we are already intimately involved in this process. Federal purchase of lands for any wildlife refuge—whether the refuge is new or already in existence—cannot occur unless the Interior appropriations bill specifically allocates funding from the Land and Water Conservation Fund for this purpose.

However, this bill goes too far in requiring that authorizing legislation be approved before a wildlife refuge can be created. Such a requirement would sharply limit the creation of wildlife refuges—taking away from the Federal Government a key tool in protecting critically important lands and wildlife in a manner that imposes very limited regulatory burdens.

If this bill had been in effect in 1992, it could potentially have prevented the creation of the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge in southern Sacramento County. Stone Lakes is a fine example of the opportunities that the National Wildlife Refuge System presents for cooperative, voluntary environmental protection. Since the creation of the refuge, the Fish and Wildlife Service has acquired approximately 800 acres from willing sellers and is in the process of arranging the donation of an additional 1,400 acres for the refuge. The agency is also working to develop cooperative land management agreements with other governmental bodies that own some 5,500 acres within the refuge boundaries.

Through these arrangements, the Federal Government is maximizing environmental benefits while minimizing its costs as well as impacts on private property owners. The benefits are tremendous. The site is a key link for the migratory birds that inhabit California's Central Valley. In addition, Stone Lakes is already a part of nonregulatory solutions to the challenge of species and resource protection—serving as a mitigation site for wetlands and endangered species preservation. Finally, the proximity of this rich resource to the urbanized Sacramento area provides an invaluable opportunity for area residents to enjoy the refuge's benefits.

Stone Lakes exemplifies the possibilities of the National Refuge System. This bill makes a grave mistake in creating major obstacles for the creation of similar sites elsewhere in the country. I strongly oppose these provisions and urge their removal from the bill.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1675, a bill to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System should be called the Republican Bill To Kill the National Wildlife Refuge System. Throughout my 20-plus years in Congress, I have actively supported legislation which would provide increased protection for

America's dwindling natural resources and endangered wildlife, thus ensuring their preservation for the benefit of future generations. I have been mindful of the concerns about the continuing reports of neglect and mistreatment on National Wildlife Refuge lands. However, the bill before us today, instead of helping a delicate system, it would hurt the National Wildlife Refuge System.

This bill to amend the National Wildlife Refuge Act, would in fact significantly alter the management of national wildlife refuges in this country. This bill would weaken the ability of the Fish and Wildlife Service to manage competing public uses of the system; dilute consideration of the public interest from refuge management decisions; open refuges to new or expanded "recreational" activities, including commercial trapping; severely limit the use of the Land and Water Conservation Fund to create new refuges; would create an unneeded exemption process to facilitate military use of refuge lands; and, would strip refuges of reserved water rights. There are currently existing protections and innovative supports for the valuable and precious refuge system. President Clinton's Executive order of March 15, 1996 assures that hunting and fishing will continue to be priority uses of the refuge system. This bill, H.R. 1675 is unnecessary to advance the interests of hunting and fishing and would do serious environmental damage to an "unrenewable" system of lands this nation relies on for conservation of precious fish and wildlife, which we must protect and preserve for our children and grandchildren.

There are good laws currently on the books that need to be funded and supported. Providing recreational activities compatible with wildlife conservation is already an extremely high priority for the National Wildlife Refuge System. As of fiscal year 1995, over 95 percent of the 92 million acres in the Refuge System were open to hunting. Most recently, President Clinton further amplified this emphasis by last month issuing Executive Order 12996 which directs the Secretary of the Interior to "provide expanded opportunities" for priority public uses including hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation.

Major environmental protection groups oppose this bill. The Washington Post this morning said in an editorial that the wildlife refuge system should be left alone. There is a report that the President would veto this bill as currently written. Again, the Gingrich Republicans in the Congress have exercised the option of wasting time to forward their conservative agenda in a meaningless exercise instead of negotiating and compromising for responsible governing.

I intend to continue to work to ensure that America's beautiful public lands and wildlife are enjoyed and treasured for years to come. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 1675.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, earlier this month, I held eight townhall meetings throughout my district to celebrate Earth Day and listen to what people think about how this Congress is handling the environment.

Time and time again, I heard people say that they strongly favor measures to preserve our natural heritage and oppose efforts by Re-

publican leaders to gut important conservation laws, like the National Wildlife Refuge Act that we're now considering.

This bill will open up national wilderness areas to hunting and fishing, as well as make it more difficult to establish new refuges.

This underscores why other environmental legislation we passed earlier this week was a mere figleaf to hide what the majority in the House do not want the American people to see—its unrelenting assault on our clean air, clean water, clean drinking water, and wilderness areas.

No wonder Bob Herbert wrote in last Friday's New York Times that when you free associate about Republican leaders on the environment, "life-affirming" is the last term that comes to mind.

Mr. Speaker, this week, while people in my district and throughout the Nation are stressing the importance of protecting the environment, Republican leaders are once again rejecting the American value of conservation. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the National Wildlife Refuge Act.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 16, 1996, and numbered 1 shall be considered by sections as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. Pursuant to the rule, each section is considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that has been printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1996".

(b) REFERENCES.—Whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or provision of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.).

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The National Wildlife Refuge System is comprised of over 91,000,000 acres of Federal lands that have been incorporated within 508 individual units located in all 50 States and our territories.

(2) The System was created to conserve fish, wildlife, and other habitats and this conservation mission has been facilitated by providing Americans opportunities to participate in wildlife-dependent recreation, including fishing and hunting, on System lands and to better appreciate the value of and need for fish and wildlife conservation.

(3) The System is comprised of lands purchased not only through the use of tax dollars but also through the sale of Duck Stamps and refuge entrance fees. It is a System paid for by those utilizing it.

(4) On March 25, 1996, the President issued Executive Order 12996 which recognized "wildlife-dependent recreational activities involving hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation as priority general public uses of the Refuge System".

(5) Executive Order 12996 is a positive step in the right direction and will serve as the foundation for the permanent statutory changes made by this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2?

If not, the clerk will designate section 3.

The text of section 3 is as follows:

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 (16 U.S.C. 668ee)—

(1) is redesignated as section 4; and
(2) as so redesignated is amended to read as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 3?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, instead of going through all the sections, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the amendment in the nature of a substitute be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

"SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

"For purposes of this Act:

"(1) The term 'compatible use' means a use that will not materially interfere with or detract from the fulfillment of the purposes of a refuge or the purposes of the System specified in section 4(a)(3), as determined by sound resource management, and based on reliable scientific information.

"(2) The terms 'conserving', 'conservation', 'manage', 'managing', and 'management', when used with respect to fish and wildlife, mean to use, in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws, methods and procedures associated with modern scientific resource programs including protection, research, census, law enforcement, habitat management, propagation, live trapping and transplantation, and regulated taking.

"(3) The term 'Coordination Area' means a wildlife management area that is acquired by the Federal Government and subsequently made available to a State—

"(A) by cooperative agreement between the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the State fish and game agency pursuant to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661-666c); or

"(B) by long-term leases or agreements pursuant to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (50 Stat. 525; 7 U.S.C. 1010 et seq.).

"(4) The term 'Director' means the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

"(5) The terms 'fish', 'wildlife', and 'fish and wildlife' mean any wild member of the animal kingdom whether alive or dead, and regardless of whether the member was bred, hatched, or born in captivity, including a part, product, egg, or offspring of the member.

"(6) The term 'hunt' and 'hunting' do not include any taking of the American alligator (*Alligator mississippiensis*) or its eggs.

"(7) The term 'person' means any individual, partnership, corporation or association.

"(8) The term 'plant' means any member of the plant kingdom in a wild, unconfined state, including any plant community, seed, root, or other part of a plant.

"(9) The terms 'purposes of the refuge' and 'purposes of each refuge' mean the purposes specified in or derived from the law, proclamation, executive order, agreement, public land order, donation document, or administrative memorandum establishing, authorizing, or expanding a refuge, refuge unit, or refuge subunit.

"(10) The term 'refuge' means a designated area of land, water, or an interest in land or water within the System, but does not include national servitudes, or Coordination Areas.

"(11) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior.

"(12) The terms 'State' and 'United States' mean the several States of the United States, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the insular possessions of the United States.

"(13) The term 'System' means the National Wildlife Refuge System designated under section 4(a)(1).

"(14) The terms 'take', 'taking', or 'taken' mean to pursue, hunt, shoot, capture, collect, or kill, or to attempt to pursue, hunt, shoot, capture, collect, or kill."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 4 (16 U.S.C. 668dd) is amended by striking "Secretary of the Interior" each place it appears and inserting "Secretary".

SEC. 4. MISSION AND PURPOSES OF THE SYSTEM.

Section 4(a) (16 U.S.C. 668dd(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively;

(2) in clause (i) of paragraph (6) (as so redesignated), by striking "paragraph (2)" and inserting "paragraph (5)"; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraphs:

"(2) The overall mission of the System is to conserve and manage fish, wildlife, and plants and their habitats within the System for the benefit of present and future generations of the people of the United States.

"(3) The purposes of the System are—

"(A) to provide a national network of lands and waters designed to conserve and manage fish, wildlife, and plants and their habitats;

"(B) to conserve, manage, and where appropriate restore fish and wildlife populations, plant communities, and refuge habitats within the System;

"(C) to conserve and manage migratory birds, anadromous or interjurisdictional fish species, and marine mammals within the System;

"(D) to provide opportunities for compatible uses of refuges consisting of fish- and wildlife-dependent recreation, including fishing and hunting, wildlife observation, and environmental education;

"(E) to preserve, restore, and recover fish, wildlife, and plants within the System that

are listed or are candidates for threatened species or endangered species under section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533) and the habitats on which these species depend; and

"(F) to fulfill as appropriate international treaty obligations of the United States with respect to fish, wildlife, and plants, and their habitats."

SEC. 5. ADMINISTRATION OF THE SYSTEM.

(a) ADMINISTRATION, GENERALLY.—Section 4(a) (16 U.S.C. 668dd(a)) (as amended by section 3 of this Act) is further amended by inserting after new paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) In administering the System, the Secretary shall—

"(A) ensure that the mission and purposes of the System described in paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively, and the purposes of each refuge are carried out, except that if a conflict exists between the purposes of a refuge and any purpose of the System, the conflict shall be resolved in a manner that first protects the purposes of the refuge, and, to the extent practicable, that also achieves the purposes of the System;

"(B) provide for conservation of fish and wildlife and their habitats within the System;

"(C) ensure effective coordination, interaction, and cooperation with owners of land adjoining refuges and the fish and wildlife agency of the States in which the units of the System are located;

"(D) assist in the maintenance of adequate water quantity and water quality to fulfill the purposes of the System and the purposes of each refuge;

"(E) acquire under State law through purchase, exchange, or donation water rights that are needed for refuge purposes;

"(F) plan, propose, and direct appropriate expansion of the System in the manner that is best designed to accomplish the purposes of the System and the purposes of each refuge and to complement efforts of States and other Federal agencies to conserve fish and wildlife and their habitats;

"(G) recognize compatible uses of refuges consisting of wildlife-dependent recreational activities involving hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation as priority general public uses of the System through which the American public can develop an appreciation for fish and wildlife;

"(H) provide expanded opportunities for these priority public uses within the System when they are compatible and consistent with sound principles of fish and wildlife management;

"(I) ensure that such priority public uses receive enhanced attention in planning and management within the System;

"(J) provide increased opportunities for families to experience wildlife-dependent recreation, particularly opportunities for parents and their children to safely engage in traditional outdoor activities, such as fishing and hunting;

"(K) ensure that the biological integrity and environmental health of the System is maintained for the benefit of present and future generations of Americans;

"(L) continue, consistent with existing laws and interagency agreements, authorized or permitted uses of units of the System by other Federal agencies, including those necessary to facilitate military preparedness;

"(M) plan and direct the continued growth of the System in a manner that is best designed to accomplish the mission of the System, to contribute to the conservation of the

ecosystems of the United States, and to increase support for the System and participation from conservation partners and the public;

"(N) ensure timely and effective cooperation and collaboration with Federal agencies and State fish and wildlife agencies during the course of acquiring and managing refuges;

"(O) ensure appropriate public involvement opportunities will be provided in conjunction with refuge planning and management activities; and

"(P) identify, prior to acquisition, existing wildlife-dependent compatible uses of new refuge lands that shall be permitted to continue on an interim basis pending completion of comprehensive planning."

(b) POWERS.—Section 4(b) (16 U.S.C. 668dd(b)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking "authorized—" and inserting "authorized to take the following actions:";

(2) in paragraph (1) by striking "to enter" and inserting "Enter";

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking "to accept" and inserting "Accept"; and

(B) by striking ", and" and inserting a period;

(4) in paragraph (3) by striking "to acquire" and inserting "Acquire"; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) Subject to standards established by and the overall management oversight of the Director, and consistent with standards established by this Act, enter into cooperative agreements with State fish and wildlife agencies and other entities for the management of programs on, or parts of, a refuge."

SEC. 6. COMPATIBILITY STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES.

Section 4(d) (16 U.S.C. 668dd(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3)(A)(i) Except as provided in clause (ii), on and after the date that is 3 years after the date of the enactment of the National Wildlife Refuge Preservation Act of 1996, the Secretary shall not initiate or permit a new use of a refuge or expand, renew, or extend an existing use of a refuge, unless the Secretary has determined that the use is a compatible use.

"(ii) On lands added to the System after the date of the enactment of the National Wildlife Refuge Preservation Act of 1996, any existing fish or wildlife-dependent use of a refuge, including fishing, hunting, wildlife observation, and environmental education, shall be permitted to continue on an interim basis unless the Secretary determines that the use is not a compatible use.

"(iii) The Secretary shall permit fishing and hunting on a refuge if the Secretary determines that the activities are consistent with the principles of sound fish and wildlife management, are compatible uses, and are consistent with public safety. No other determinations or findings, except the determination of consistency with State laws and regulations provided for in subsection (m), are required to be made for fishing and hunting to occur. The Secretary may make the determination referred to in this paragraph for a refuge concurrently with the development of a conservation plan for the refuge under subsection (e).

"(B) Not later than 24 months after the date of the enactment of the National Wildlife Refuge Preservation Act of 1996, the Secretary shall issue final regulations establishing the process for determining under subparagraph (A) whether a use is a compatible use, that—

"(i) designate the refuge officer responsible for making initial compatibility determinations;

"(ii) require an estimate of the timeframe, location, manner, and purpose of each use;

"(iii) identify the effects of each use on refuge resources and purposes of each refuge;

"(iv) require that compatibility determinations be made in writing and consider the best professional judgment of the refuge officer designated under clause (i);

"(v) provide for the expedited consideration of uses that will likely have no detrimental effect on the fulfillment of the purposes of a refuge or the purposes of the System specified in subsection (a)(3);

"(vi) provide for the elimination or modification of any use as expeditiously as practicable after a determination is made that the use is not a compatible use;

"(vii) require, after an opportunity for public comment, reevaluation of each existing use, other than those uses specified in clause (viii), when conditions under which the use is permitted change significantly or when there is significant new information regarding the effects of the use, but not less frequently than once every 10 years, to ensure that the use remains a compatible use;

"(viii) require after an opportunity for public comment reevaluation of each fish and wildlife-dependent recreational use when conditions under which the use is permitted change significantly or when there is significant new information regarding the effects of the use, but not less frequently than in conjunction with each preparation or revision of a conservation plan under subsection (e) or at least every 15 years;

"(ix) provide an opportunity for public review and comment on each evaluation of a use, unless an opportunity for public review and comment on the evaluation of the use has already been provided during the development or revision of a conservation plan for the refuge under subsection (e) or has otherwise been provided during routine, periodic determinations of compatibility for fish- and wildlife-dependent recreational uses; and

"(x) provide that when managed in accordance with principles of sound fish and wildlife management, fishing, hunting, wildlife observation, and environmental education in a refuge are generally compatible uses.

"(4) The provisions of this Act relating to determinations of the compatibility of a use shall not apply to—

"(A) overflights above a refuge; and

"(B) activities authorized, funded, or conducted by a Federal agency (other than the United States Fish and Wildlife Service) which has primary jurisdiction over the refuge or a portion of the refuge, if the management of those activities is in accordance with a memorandum of understanding between the Secretary or the Director and the head of the Federal agency with primary jurisdiction over the refuge governing the use of the refuge.

"(5) Overflights above a refuge may be governed by any memorandum of understanding entered into by the Secretary that applies to the refuge."

SEC. 7. REFUGE CONSERVATION PLANNING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 (16 U.S.C. 668dd) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) through (i) as subsections (f) through (j), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e)(1)(A) Except with respect to refuge lands in Alaska (which shall be governed by the refuge planning provisions of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.)), the Secretary shall—

"(i) propose a comprehensive conservation plan for each refuge or related complex of refuges (referred to in this subsection as a 'planning unit') in the System;

"(ii) publish a notice of opportunity for public comment in the Federal Register on each proposed conservation plan;

"(iii) issue a final conservation plan for each planning unit consistent with the provisions of this Act and, to the extent practicable, consistent with fish and wildlife conservation plans of the State in which the refuge is located; and

"(iv) not less frequently than 15 years after the date of issuance of a conservation plan under clause (iii) and every 15 years thereafter, revise the conservation plan as may be necessary.

"(B) The Secretary shall prepare a comprehensive conservation plan under this subsection for each refuge within 15 years after the date of enactment of the National Wildlife Refuge Preservation Act of 1996.

"(C) The Secretary shall manage each refuge or planning unit under plans in effect on the date of enactment of the National Wildlife Refuge Preservation Act of 1996, to the extent such plans are consistent with this Act, until such plans are revised or superseded by new comprehensive conservation plans issued under this subsection.

"(D) Uses or activities consistent with this Act may occur on any refuge or planning unit before existing plans are revised or new comprehensive conservation plans are issued under this subsection.

"(E) Upon completion of a comprehensive conservation plan under this subsection for a refuge or planning unit, the Secretary shall manage the refuge or planning unit in a manner consistent with the plan and shall revise the plan at any time if the Secretary determines that conditions that affect the refuge or planning unit have changed significantly.

"(2) In developing each comprehensive conservation plan under this subsection for a planning unit, the Secretary, acting through the Director, shall identify and describe—

"(A) the purposes of each refuge comprising the planning unit and the purposes of the System applicable to those refuges;

"(B) the distribution, migration patterns, and abundance of fish, wildlife, and plant populations and related habitats within the planning unit;

"(C) the archaeological and cultural values of the planning unit;

"(D) such areas within the planning unit that are suitable for use as administrative sites or visitor facilities;

"(E) significant problems that may adversely affect the populations and habitats of fish, wildlife, and plants within the planning unit and the actions necessary to correct or mitigate such problems; and

"(F) the opportunities for fish- and wildlife-dependent recreation, including fishing and hunting, wildlife observation, environmental education, interpretation of the resources and values of the planning unit, and other uses that may contribute to refuge management.

"(3) In preparing each comprehensive conservation plan under this subsection, and

any revision to such a plan, the Secretary, acting through the Director, shall, to the maximum extent practicable and consistent with this Act—

"(A) consult with adjoining Federal, State, local, and private landowners and affected State conservation agencies; and

"(B) coordinate the development of the conservation plan or revision of the plan with relevant State conservation plans for fish and wildlife and their habitats.

"(4)(A) In accordance with subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall develop and implement a process to ensure an opportunity for active public involvement in the preparation and revision of comprehensive conservation plans under this subsection. At a minimum, the Secretary shall require that publication of any final plan shall include a summary of the comments made by States, adjacent or potentially affected landowners, local governments, and any other affected parties, together with a statement of the disposition of concerns expressed in those comments.

"(B) Prior to the adoption of each comprehensive conservation plan under this subsection, the Secretary shall issue public notice of the draft proposed plan, make copies of the plan available at the affected field and regional offices of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and provide opportunity for public comment."

SEC. 8. EMERGENCY POWER; PRESIDENTIAL EXEMPTION; STATE AUTHORITY; WATER RIGHTS; COORDINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 (16 U.S.C. 668dd) is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(k) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act the Secretary may temporarily suspend, allow, or initiate any activity in a refuge in the System in the event of any emergency that constitutes an imminent danger to the health and safety of the public or any fish or wildlife population, including any activity to control or eradicate sea lampreys, zebra mussels, or any other aquatic nuisance species (as that term is defined in section 1003 of the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 4702)).

"(l)(1) The President may exempt from any provision of this Act any activity conducted by the Department of Defense on a refuge within the System if the President finds that—

"(A) the activity is in the paramount interest of the United States for reasons of national security; and

"(B) there is no feasible and prudent alternative location on public lands for the activity.

"(2) After the President authorizes an exemption under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense shall undertake, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior, appropriate steps to mitigate the effect of the exempted activity on the refuge.

"(m) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the Secretary to control or regulate hunting or fishing of fish and resident wildlife on lands or waters not within the System.

"(n) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of the several States to manage, control, or regulate fish and resident wildlife under State law or regulations in any area within the System. Regulations permitting hunting or fishing of fish and resident wildlife within the System shall be, to the extent practicable, consistent with State fish and wildlife laws, regulations, or management plans.

"(o)(1) Nothing in this Act shall—

"(A) create a reserved water right, express or implied, in the United States for any purpose;

"(B) affect any water right in existence on the date of enactment of the National Wildlife Refuge Preservation Act of 1996; or

"(C) affect any Federal or State law in existence on the date of the enactment of the National Wildlife Refuge Preservation Act of 1996 regarding water quality or water quantity.

"(2) Nothing in this Act shall diminish or affect the ability to join the United States in the adjudication of rights to the use of water pursuant to the McCarran Act (43 U.S.C. 666).

"(p) Coordination with State fish and wildlife agency personnel or with personnel of other affected State agencies pursuant to this Act shall not be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 4(c) (16 U.S.C. 668dd(c)) is amended by striking the last sentence.

SEC. 9. STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act is intended to affect—

(1) the provisions for subsistence uses in Alaska set forth in the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (Public Law 96-487), including those in titles III and VIII of that Act;

(2) the provisions of section 102 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, the jurisdiction over subsistence uses in Alaska, or any assertion of subsistence uses in the Federal courts; and

(3) the manner in which section 810 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act is implemented in refuges in Alaska, and the determination of compatible use as it relates to subsistence uses in these refuges.

SEC. 10. NEW REFUGES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be expended from the Land and Water Conservation Fund established by Public Law 88-578, for the creation of a new refuge within the National Wildlife Refuge System without specific authorization from Congress pursuant to recommendation from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, to create that new refuge.

SEC. 11. REORGANIZATIONAL TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) REORGANIZATIONAL AMENDMENTS.—The Act of October 15, 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.) is amended—

(1) by adding before section 4 the following new section:

"SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

"This Act may be cited as the 'National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966.'";

(2) by striking sections 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10; and

(3) in section 4 (16 U.S.C. 668dd), as in effect immediately before the enactment of this Act—

(A) by redesignating that section as section 2;

(B) by striking "SEC. 4."; and

(C) by inserting before and immediately above the text of the section the following new heading:

"SEC. 4. NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 12(f) of the Act of December 5, 1969 (83 Stat. 283) is repealed.

(c) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, regulation, or other document of the United States to section 4 of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 is deemed to refer to section 2 of that Act, as redesignated by subsection (a)(4) of this section.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NADLER: Strike section 10 (page 23, lines 3 through 10).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to protect both the environment and property owners from further government micromanagement.

My amendment seeks to strike from the bill section 10, the provision calling for specific congressional authorization for the purchase of every single new wildlife refuge that uses money from the land and water conservation fund. The current system, which my amendment would retain, allows the use of funds from the land and water conservation fund to establish a wildlife refuge either by a specific act of Congress or by administrative act of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Historically, when a refuge is being sought through the administration process, the Fish and Wildlife Service submits a list of proposed purchases to the Congress for our approval through the Interior appropriations bill. Whether a refuge is being purchased due to a specific legislation initiative or administratively, land is purchased at fair market value as determined by approved appraisal procedures according to Federal law.

The land is purchased, Mr. Chairman, only from willing sellers. While the Fish and Wildlife Service does have condemnation authority, it has not acquired land from condemnation for many years and does not have any plans to do so in the future. In fact, the Fish and Wildlife Service states:

Condemnation has been used sparingly throughout the service's land acquisition history. The service recognizes the possible social and economic impacts of acquiring private property by exercising the right of eminent domain and does its utmost to avoid using this approach.

Mr. Chairman, the era of big government is supposed to be behind us. Creating the need for Congress to authorize no specific legislation every single refuge is unnecessary and burdensome. The current process of using land and water conservation funds is working for landowners and for the environment. The landowners, who again are willing sellers, receive fair compensation quickly. In turn, the habitats and animals that are in need of protection receive it in a timely manner.

□ 1530

Adding another layer of bureaucracy, the entire congressional authorization process, to this process, will do nothing but create a backlog of pending purchases of land for refuges. Then while Congress muddles through authorizing

each single potential purchase, landowners, willing sellers, would be left waiting for Congress to act to collect the funds to which they are entitled.

While the debate rages on about how to best protect property owners and the environment at the same time, we have in this amendment an opportunity to protect both property owners and the environment by providing a way for the landowner to be fairly compensated and the environment to be protected. I urge my colleagues to protect the property owners who want to sell the land and environment, which needs the land at the same time.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, purchases made with money from the land and water conservation fund operate differently from virtually every other type of Federal land acquisition. Now, there is a legitimate reason for that. The land and water conservation fund needs to be available for emergencies. I will offer a substitute amendment to address any conceivable emergency situation.

The Nadler amendment goes a step further to extract the Congress from legitimate policy making. I think that goes too far.

The section the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] is amending is already very narrow. The bill would not change the procedures for expanding any existing refuge and, with my amendment, it would not change the procedures for any emergency acquisitions of new refuges. So we are talking about very few cases where the new restriction in section 10 would apply. In those cases, it is perfectly legitimate to exercise congressional oversight. That is what the people send us here for.

I would also add that this discussion is quite hypothetical. Given the budget crunch, the Interior Department is not going to be able to manage much new land in the near future. The administration has projected in its budget that no new refuge land will be acquired in fiscal year 1997.

In short, my amendment takes care of the problem with section 10 of the original bill. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the Nadler amendment.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. When the gentleman talked about "your" language, he is talking about his language in the en bloc amendments that he is going to offer, is that correct?

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it is essentially the same language, the 500.

Mr. MILLER of California. What I do not understand, I am looking at two different languages. One deals with the issue of expansion.

Mr. BOEHLERT. The staff will bring that over.

Mr. MILLER of California. The language originally, correct me if I am wrong, it was my understanding that the language in the en bloc amendment that the gentleman was going to offer went with the creation of the refuge in excess of 500 acres. This language that the gentleman is now discussing goes both to the creation and to the expansion.

Mr. BOEHLERT. That is the same language as in my en bloc amendment.

Mr. MILLER of California. The same language in the original. So is the gentleman going to offer his en bloc language to Nadler?

Mr. BOEHLERT. Because of the way this is flowing, the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] is first up, his amendment was printed in the RECORD, so it is timely for me to address his specific amendment.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman would in that event require the Congress' specific authorization for the expansion of an existing refuge?

Mr. BOEHLERT. No, for new refuges in excess of 500 acres, and the expansion of any of those refuges.

Mr. MILLER of California. If one looks at the second to the last line, it says "create or expand that new refuge."

Mr. BOEHLERT. That is correct. We are just talking about new refuges over 500 and if you expand those.

Mr. MILLER of California. You are grandfathering all of the existing refuges in?

Mr. BOEHLERT. That is right.

Mr. MILLER of California. They can be expanded without direct authorization. The new refuge, from today forward, if you expand that new refuge, would you require specific authorization?

Mr. BOEHLERT. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER of California. So if there was an inholding of 501 acres, we would have to get a direct authorization from Congress?

Mr. BOEHLERT. That is correct, to expand it.

Mr. MILLER of California. OK. If there is an inholding of 501 acres in an existing refuge, they can do that under the Secretary's discretion in the land and water conservation?

Half the heads are going up and down and half sideways.

Mr. BOEHLERT. None of this applies to existing refuges. What I am suggesting is as we go forward and we develop new refuges, we should have the authority to go and acquire refuges of less than 500 acres just like that, because they are time sensitive. We all know the reasons why. If we go into a massive refuge, in excess of 500 acres, I think then the Congress should have authorizing responsibility and fulfill that responsibility.

The gentleman and I, as so often on these issues, are on the same wavelength.

Mr. MILLER of California. If the new refuge needed to be expanded, it would take a direct authorization?

Mr. BOEHLERT. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER of California. If an existing refuge in existence today needs to be expanded beyond 500 acres, that would not take a direct authorization?

Mr. BOEHLERT. That is correct.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOEHLERT AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOEHLERT as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. NADLER: Strike the text of the amendment and insert instead:

"Strike section 10 and insert instead:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be expended from the Land and Water Conservation Fund established by Public Law 88-578, for the creation of a new refuge having a total area greater than 500 acres or the expansion of a new refuge of any acreage within the National Wildlife Refuge System without specific authorization of Congress pursuant to a recommendation of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, to create or expand that new refuge. For purposes of this section, a new refuge is a refuge created after the date of enactment of the National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act."

Mr. BOEHLERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOEHLERT. I will not take up more time, because we have already had the argument for the rationale for the amendment in my exchange with the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is not in order. The gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] has a motion to strike. The gentleman from New York may have a substitute.

Mr. BOEHLERT. That is what I asked for. I said I had a substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot have a substitute to the Nadler amendment. What the gentleman could do is have a substitute to section 10, and what Mr. NADLER's motion is is an amendment to strike section 10.

PERFECTING AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOEHLERT

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Perfecting amendment offered by Mr. BOEHLERT: "Strike section 10 (page 23, lines 3 through 10) and insert instead:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be expended from the Land and Water Conservation Fund established by Public Law 88-578, for the creation of a new refuge having a total area greater than 500 acres or the expansion of a new refuge of any acreage within the National Wildlife Refuge System without specific authorization of Congress pursuant to a recommendation of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, to create or expand that new refuge. For purposes of this section, a new refuge is a refuge created after the date of enactment of the National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act."

Mr. BOEHLERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the perfecting amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was not objection.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, once again, the same holds true. I think we have had the discussion, the colloquy I had with the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], and I have made the case for the perfecting amendment. I ask that it be considered.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], and correct me if I am wrong, please, but as I read his whatever kind of amendment it is, if I read the perfecting amendment correctly, if I read the language, it says "The creation of a new refuge having a total area greater than 500 acres of the expansion of a new refuge of an acreage needs specific Congressional authorization," and then it says "for the purpose of this section, new refuges are refuges created after the date of enactment."

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me stress, the new refuge in excess of 500 acres, that is what I want Congress to have a say on. I want emergency situations taken care of, obviously, with the authority to proceed with 20, 30, 50, 100, 200 acres. Very often they are very time-sensitive. You need to grab the deal when you can get it. We are talking about a sizeable number of acres, 500 or more, where I think the elected body of the people's House should have its say.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, that may be his intent, but as I read the amendment, I think what it says, and the gentleman may not intend for it to say that, is if next year, without congressional authorization, the Fish and Wildlife Service were to establish a 200-acre refuge, which the gentleman thinks should not need congressional authorization, and 3 years later they decide they want another 20 acres, that is an expansion of a new refuge and they would need authority.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman is performing a very valuable public service by this colloquy, because we are enlightening future generations with this exchange.

My clear intent is to deal with new refuges of more than 500 acres, and then if you expand them. But the illustration the gentleman just gave us, 200 acres, which they have the authority to acquire immediately right now, if next year in their wisdom they decide to acquire 20 more acres, no problem, you do not have to come up to the people's House to ask our permission to do so. We do not have to have any hearings. We just proceed.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate his explanation, and this is legislative history. But I think Mr. Scalia and the Supreme Court and several others have scant regard for legislative history. I would submit that the plain language of the amendment says very clearly that a new refuge is a refuge created after a given date, and the expansion of a new refuge of any acreage needs congressional authorization. So "new refuge" is one of any acreage, 200 acres. If you want to expand it later by 20 more, you need congressional authorization.

That may not have been the gentleman's intent, but that is what it says. This colloquy, as enlightening as it is, I do not think will be regarded by the courts.

I would urge the gentleman, I do not agree with the amendment in any event, but I would urge him, sir, even to effectuate what he wants to do, that he ought to change the wording of the perfecting amendment.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think we have had a good, healthy exchange. Everyone has had the opportunity to listen to our respective points of view.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Boehlert amendment and compliment the gentleman in his effort.

Mr. Chairman, I object to the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] for two basic reasons. You talk about a willing seller-willing buyer. A willing buyer, yes, but not always the seller. There have been cases where Fish and Wildlife has gone into an area and drawn a refuge around different landholders in long, spidery ways, surrounding them, and then declaring the area around these private landholders as a refuge, and they are inside the refuge, being then an inholder.

Then what happens, the land value decreases dramatically from anybody else, because they are under certain restrictions because it is called a buffer zone. So what would occur under the gentleman's thoughts here would be in reality an agency willing to go in and

get 499 acres around an area, and the willing seller would only have one buyer. Any time you have one buyer, and that buyer being the U.S. Government, and one owner being put in that kind of spot, it has a devastating effect on that one owner. We have seen that occur not just with this administration, but other administrations also. So this is not partisan.

We are trying to avoid that. We are allowing them to get a certain amount of acreage in an emergency case. But every other time they have got to come back to this Congress to authorize, for us to say it is the right thing to do, and not be put into the position of making the landowners subvert to the Federal Government.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I just want to underline the importance of the gentleman's remarks and agree with them fully, and tell the body that in my own case in the 6th District of Wisconsin years ago, Fish and Wildlife Service was acquiring land without Congressional authorization, and sending letters to landowners, farmers principally, which they thought meant they were subject to eminent domain and were being forced to sell. There were outrages and protests. Finally we heard they did not have any legal authority for doing what they did and managed to get it stopped.

I would not let this completely out of the box. I would keep some type of opportunity to review and make them justify to neutral, informed observers what they are actually doing, so we do not see Government get a little too heavyhanded.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am suggesting with the Boehlert amendment we have solved the problems of the emergency. But we have also put a cap on the administration or the agency itself of misusing its power as it has done in the past.

The gentleman from New York may not be aware of this, but this has occurred. All we are saying is we have a responsibility as Congressmen, and the Member of that district has the responsibility if a refuge is in fact proposed that is beyond 500 acres, then in reality they ought to come back here and talk to the chairman of the subcommittee and the Members, and especially the Member of that district. So I support the Boehlert amendment, and I definitely oppose the Nadler amendment.

□ 1545

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his valuable

support. This is a significant improvement to the bill because it allows emergency purchases of environmentally sensitive lands and that is exactly what we want to do. Keep in mind the overwhelming majority of refuges around the country are less than 500 acres.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I am told that the statement that was made a moment ago is not correct—408 of the 503 refuges in the country are over 500 acres. That is the first point.

The second point is that I understand the remarks of the gentleman from Alaska, but the normal procedure admittedly not followed this past year because Congress did not pass any appropriations bills, or the relevant appropriations bills, but the normal procedure is when a refuge is sought, the Fish and Wildlife Service submits a list of proposed purchases to the Congress and the Congress approves it through the committee report on the Subcommittee on the Interior appropriations bill. And that that has been invariably followed, that the report language of the Subcommittee on the Interior of the Committee on Appropriations lists which refuges should be bought with the LWCF appropriation and that the committee is only appropriated enough money to cover the cost of purchasing the refuges that it lists.

Now, it is true this is not binding, but all parties have abided by this list except this past year when there was no appropriations bill and, therefore, no appropriations language.

Mr. Chairman, I would submit that rather than requiring authorizing legislation, which we know can take a long time and add whole layers of proceedings before we get a refuge, that the process we have now, where essentially Congress signs off on it through the report of the Subcommittee on the Interior, is a better way to go. And, therefore, I would oppose the gentleman's perfecting amendment.

I think that as long as we have that control through the Subcommittee on the Interior language, and maybe we ought to codify that, but the fact is that is the way we have been doing it, Congress has the control.

The second point I would make is simply again, with all due deference, the fact is the language of the perfecting amendment says very clearly that you need congressional authorizing legislation for the creation of a new refuge having a total greater than 500 acres or the expansion of a new refuge of any acreage, period; a new refuge being defined as anything created after this date.

So what that clearly means, whatever the intent of the author of the amendment and what the courts will clearly read into it, it is not interpretation, just read the clear language, it

says that if a new refuge is created of less than 500 acres you do not need congressional approval for that, but for the expansion of such a new refuge a year or two later, also less than 500 acres, totaling less than 500 acres, you would need congressional authorizing approval for that.

It is clearly not what the gentleman intends but it is what the language suggests. So even if you agree with the gentleman, it should be changed before we vote on it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NADLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to say that I think that he is correct and that I concur on the plain reading of the amendment and I have some concerns with it. And that is that when we originally discussed this, I believe the original Pombo amendment was to go to the creation of a new refuge, that Congress ought to be involved in that decision and that ought to take a direct authorization.

I think there was sort of general agreement about that, but what we have here is not only the creation but the expansion of that new refuge. And I think what the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] is reading is in fact correct on its face; and that is that any expansion, be it 20 acres or 200 acres, would require a direct authorization. I think that would be even true in the case where you have a willing seller and a willing buyer. So you would have to come back to Congress and wait around for that.

There has been the discussion of an emergency situation, but there is no reference or I do not understand the reference to an emergency situation of 20 or 30 acres, because it says quite specifically, pursuant to recommendations of the Fish and Wildlife Service to create or expand a new refuge, that it cannot be done without specific authorization of Congress. And that goes to the expansion, and there is no acreage limitation on the issue of expansion.

Very often we have willing sellers and willing buyers, either that are inholdings or on the boundary, that seek to have the purchase of their lands made. And I think in that particular case we ought not to require that to come to Congress.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would hope prior to either the acceptance of this amendment, or if it would be voted on or what have you, I do not know if it would be prevailed on or not; but I think that language should be corrected because I think it is going to be an obstacle. And if we are concerned, and I think in our committee we had some legitimate concerns raised—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] has expired.

(On request of Mr. MILLER of California, and by unanimous consent, Mr. NADLER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. NADLER. I continue to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, where we had the notion of creating a new refuge, and some of that may or may not have been speculative in nature, and landholders did not know what was going to happen or not happen, and that the authorization was a way to tell people what their situation was with respect to the creation of that. It is not a speculation that could go on year after year after year after year and inhibit people's ability to possibly use or sell their land.

But I think this amendment goes way beyond that. I think this amendment does not do what the author wants it to do and it ought to be reconfigured certainly with respect to the problems regarding expansion.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would point out simply that the language of this amendment says the expansion of a new refuge of any acreage. That clearly means a new refuge that is less than 500 acres. If we want to expand it by 32 acres or 60 acres, it requires the authorization of Congress. And if the gentleman did not intend that, I would hope the gentleman would change by unanimous consent his own amendment to make clear what he does intend because the language is very clear.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] knows, when this bill originally came up before the committee and my amendment was offered to restrict the creation of a new wildlife refuge without the direct authorization of Congress, it met very little resistance in the committee and, in fact, passed on a voice vote in the committee; because it only made common sense that if we are obligating funds, taxpayer money, if we are obligating Federal funds from a Federal account, that Congress and the authorizing committee, of which the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is the ranking member, and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] is the chairman, ought to have the ability to ask questions about what the priorities are.

There are limited amounts of money that can be expended every year. So it is extremely important that we prioritize where those dollars are going to be spent, what scientific basis there is for creating that refuge, where they want to create it, and that Congress does take that authorization stance.

Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] brought up that Congress does appropriate the money and it does

come through the Subcommittee on Interior appropriations, which is correct. That does happen. But the reason that it happens that way is because Fish and Wildlife goes out, creates a new refuge somewhere, with no congressional oversight whatsoever, obligates the U.S. taxpayer to millions of dollars to purchase that refuge, plus additional operating expenses to continue to maintain that refuge on an annual basis, and our property owners come to us and say, look, we have just been put in the middle of a wildlife refuge. I am now a willing seller because I cannot use my property anymore; or I live under restrictions of the Fish and Wildlife Service now and the only person that will purchase my property now is the Federal Government because they have just designated me a wildlife refuge. So we have to go to the Committee on Appropriations and say, please buy these people's land that we have already taken.

There is absolutely nothing wrong with congressional oversight. There is nothing wrong with the U.S. Congress doing the job that they are supposed to be doing, and that is watching over the people's money.

I do not understand, Mr. Chairman, how anybody could come down here and seriously say that we should create wildlife refuges, for example, according to Fish and Wildlife Service they purchased a little over 1,200 acres in California last year for a wildlife refuge at the cost of \$10.5 million. Now, that is a lot of money. They did that without any congressional oversight whatsoever, without us determining whether or not this was a priority site. And it may have been a priority site, but Congress ought to take an affirmative step, step in and say whether or not it is a priority, whether or not the science backs it up or whether or not there may be someplace else that is a higher priority.

To have someone seriously say that Congress should not, and should abdicate its responsibilities and let the unelected bureaucrats, the unelected faceless, nameless bureaucracy take control of money that should be under the direct control of Congress, I do not understand. This is a very important issue. This is not just something that someone came up with at night.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] and I have disagreed on a lot of things. He came in with concerns about this and we sat down and we worked out an agreement, and we said anything over 500 acres, or if they want to expand that new refuge so that in 1 year they do not come in and say we are going to buy 490 acres and the next year we are going to expand it with 10,000 acres. We felt this was a reasonable compromise. We felt it was something everyone should support and it should be totally noncontroversial.

Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] and I are on the same side of something, it should be noncontroversial. It is a good amendment that should pass, and I believe that Congress should not abdicate its responsibilities and we should have full oversight authority over these refuges.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POMBO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that this is consistent with the existing policy that the Secretary of the Interior is already familiar with as it pertains to national parks. If there is going to be an addition to the national parks, the Secretary of the Interior is used to coming to Capitol Hill to get the authorization.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that is absolutely correct. If we want to add to a national park, which may be very important and it may be a priority, Congress must approve that in order to do it. If we want to add to the Forest Service lands, they have to come to Congress to do it. But in this one instance we do not have to do that, and we are trying to correct an oversight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. POMBO was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I want to know if the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], regardless of the merits of the entire question, would at least agree to a unanimous-consent request to amend Mr. BOEHLERT's amendment to make it do what he says it would do; so to say it would then read, withstanding any other provision of law, no funds would be expended, et cetera, et cetera, for the creation of a new refuge for a total area greater than 500, or the expansions of any refuge of any acreage that would result in the new refuge than being 500 or more acres.

If the gentleman put in that language, it would at least make clear it would do what the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] says he intends to do and do what the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] seem to want to do.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I yield to the chairman, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my problem is the gentleman

from New York spoke so fast and said et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. When I see a few et ceteras, I get a little concerned.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

□ 1600

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, what I am proposing is that the gentleman would amend the amendment to read as follows: Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be expended from the land and water conservation fund established by Public Law 88-578 for the creation of a new refuge having a total area greater than 500 acres or the expansion of a new refuge of any acreage that would result in the new refuge having a total land area greater than 500 acres within the national wildlife refuge system, and so forth.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I will accept that. In the spirit of comity, two New Yorkers working something out, that is very positive and very constructive.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would point out that if there is to be a modification by unanimous consent, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] may request unanimous consent to modify his amendment. That amendment modification must be submitted in writing.

MODIFICATION OF PERFECTING AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOEHLERT

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the perfecting amendment be modified as proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] and that the modification be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification of perfecting amendment offered by Mr. BOEHLERT:

In lieu of the matter proposed insert "Strike section 10 and insert instead:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be expended from the Land and Water Conservation Fund established by Public Law 88-578, for the creation of a new refuge having a total area greater than 500 acres or the expansion of a new refuge of any acreage that would result in the new refuge have an acreage of more than 500 acres within the National Wildlife Refuge System without specific authorization of Congress pursuant to a recommendation of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, to create or expand that new refuge. For purposes of this section, a new refuge is a refuge created after the date of enactment of this act.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The perfecting amendment is modified.

The question is on the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], as modified.

The perfecting, as modified, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOEHLERT

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOEHLERT:

COORDINATION AREAS

In section 6, in the matter proposed as section 4(d)(3)(A) of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, add at the end the following new clause:

"(iv) A new use of a Coordination Area first made available to a State after the date of enactment of the National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1996 may not be initiated or permitted unless the Secretary determines that the use is a compatible use.

In section 6, in the matter proposed as section 4(d)(3)(B) of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, after "a use" the first place it appears insert "of a refuge".

COMPATIBILITY OF FISHING AND HUNTING

In section 3(a)(2), in the matter amended to read as section 4(1) of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, strike "the purposes of the System specified in section 4(a)(3)" and insert "the overall mission and purposes of the System specified in sections 4(a)(2) and (3), respectively."

In section 6, in the matter proposed as section 4(d)(3)(A)(iii) of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, after "uses" insert "(consistent with the purposes of the System under subsection (a)(3))".

In section 8(a), strike the close quotation marks and the second period at the end, and add the following new subsection:

"(q) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as requiring or prohibiting fishing or hunting on any particular refuge except pursuant to a determination by the Secretary in accordance with this Act."

Mr. BOEHLERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to eliminate some legitimate concerns that have been raised about this bill. We want to ensure that this bill strengthens the refuge system and it is built to carry out its vital conservation mission. I think this package of amendments will accomplish that objective.

The amendment addresses three problems with the bill as reported out of the Committee on Rules. That bill, by the way, was a significant improvement over the version that was reported out of the Committee on Resources originally.

The first problem concerns coordination areas. These are Federal lands

that are managed by the States. Now, neither we nor anyone else I know of has any problem with the concept of cooperative management. But we want to ensure that no one can ever use coordination areas as a back door way to allow damaging activities on refuges. The refuge system is Federal, and Federal standards are essential.

The first amendment in this package makes it clear that coordination areas have to be managed using the same standards as refuges. As a practical matter, what that means is that if some use, say jogging, was not permitted in a refuge because it would damage the wildlife and a piece of that refuge became a coordination area, jogging would still be forbidden.

I should add that this applies only to coordination areas created by the transfer of land after the bill is signed into law. We are not interfering with any existing agreements between the Federal Government and any State.

The second problem addressed by this package is the key issue of when wildlife dependent recreation, hunting, fishing, wildlife observation, and so forth, when that recreation is permitted at the refuge. Over the years the Fish and Wildlife Service has struck a delicate balance between protection of species and human enjoyment of the refuge. By and large, no one I have spoken to has a problem with that balance, not sportsmen, not environmentalists. Everyone wants to protect the balance. But the language in this bill could be interpreted as throwing aside that balance and replacing it with a new one that could be damaging to wildlife protection.

That would be intolerable. My amendment is designed to ensure that no one will ever interpret the bill in that matter. The amendments, there are three of them, make clear that recreational activities can be permitted only when the secretary determines that they would not detract from the overall mission of the refuge system. That is conservation.

The amendment makes clear that we are still requiring a balancing act here, that recreational activities can occur only when they would cause no harm. Let me repeat that: Recreational activities can occur only when they would cause no harm.

I would like to engage the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] in a colloquy on this essential point.

I appreciate the willingness of the Committee on Resources to work with us on this amendment, but I would like to clarify some issues. As I understand it, this bill is not intended to require that wildlife dependent recreation be allowed on every refuge; is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. The bill is intended to make it clear that wildlife dependent recreation must be allowed when it would not detract from the other purposes of the refuge system. It does not require that recreational activities always be allowed.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

What we all are looking for is a balancing act here between protecting species and allowing the public to enjoy the species that have been protected. Just to reemphasize that point, I would ask the chairman this question: Does the elevation of compatible wildlife dependent recreation to a purpose mean that hunting and fishing and wildlife observation and other recreational activities must always be permitted in the refuge?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, once again, it does not.

Mr. BOEHLERT. I thank my distinguished chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues for their indulgence. I also would like to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss], the cosponsor of this amendment, who is much more intimately familiar with the details of some of these issues than I am. He has lived with this for a long time. Mr. Goss and his staff have provided invaluable guidance on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, let me give particular credit to my own staff. This may be viewed as a self-serving declaration, but I happen to think I have got one of the best staffs anywhere on Capitol Hill. Two of those valued members, three of them are sitting right here with me: David Goldston, my legislative director; Jeff More, who is my professional staff member on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment; and Dr. Natalie D'Nicola, who is a science fellow. We have science-based decisionmaking in our office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOEHLERT was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, this is a difficult issue in which the future survival of species and the availability of open land for the American people are at stake. This amendment, I believe, restores a sense of balance that was lacking in the original bill. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment and the bill as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will clarify for the record, the adoption of the previous Boehlert amendment had the effect of causing the Nadler amendment, which was an amendment to strike, to fall and, therefore, that amendment would not be voted on be-

cause of the passage of the first Boehlert amendment, and the question is now on the pending Boehlert amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, would the Chair restate that? I could not follow what the Chair was saying.

The CHAIRMAN. As stated on page 233 of the House Rules and Manual, when a motion to strike out a section is pending and the section is perfected by an amendment striking and inserting to rewrite the entire section, the pending motion to strike out must fall, since it would not be in order to strike out exactly what had been inserted. Therefore, by adoption of the Boehlert amendment as modified, the Nadler amendment fell and, therefore, the Committee did not vote on the Nadler amendment to strike.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, bottom line, the language that we all agreed to is now in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take 5 minutes. I simply have an inquiry of the gentleman from New York. I assume that the language in the gentleman's en bloc amendment that dealt with the same subject that we dealt with a moment ago is no longer in your amendment?

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NADLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in an effort to finetune the bill before us, we are offering our amendment to address three specific concerns raised about H.R. 1675. Frankly, these are concerns raised by some who may oppose the bill altogether. However, it has been our approach to sit down with the interested parties, roll up our sleeves and attempt to solve the problems with the legislation in a reasonable and workable manner. Many Members and their staff have spent hours working out the details of this amendment, and we are grateful for the cooperation shown by Chairman YOUNG and SEXTON in getting to this point.

Mr. Chairman, the heart of our amendment addresses three issues:

First, what is the role of the hunting, fishing, and wildlife observation in the refuge system?

Second, how much freedom should the Fish and Wildlife Service have in

establishing—and expanding—refuges without congressional approval?

And third, what safeguards exist to ensure that the management standards of existing refuges are maintained if the management authority is put in the hands of an individual State?

In my remarks during the rule, I mentioned the legacy of J.N. "Ding" Darling—a hunter who was a steadfast conservationist. He understood that given the proper balance, hunting and conservation were compatible. The clarifications in the Boehlert-Goss amendment aim to achieve that balance, and indeed, clarify that hunting, fishing, and wildlife observation are legitimate options in some of our refuges, as long as they are compatible with the overall higher mission of conservation and preservation of wildlife.

The second issue involves the authority of the Fish and Wildlife Service to use the land and water conservation fund to establish new refuges. It is the case that unlike all other uses of the LWCF, Fish and Wildlife is not required to seek any specific authorization to establish a new refuge. I agree that Congress has the responsibility to exercise better oversight over these funds, but the broad nature of the bill language in this area has caused some concern. Our amendment would still give Fish and Wildlife the flexibility to purchase areas of 500 acres or less, while ensuring that major expenditures of taxpayer dollars are subjected to the normal, established budget process.

Finally, the last concern takes care of a consistency issue, and would ensure that land set aside for wildlife purposes today—under the wildlife refuge system—continues to be managed in a responsible manner should authority for that refuge be given to a State agency.

Again, these are not dramatic changes, but they are significant clarifications—and I would hope that my colleagues would support them.

□ 1615

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the cooperation on this bill I think proves once again that the environment does not know partisanship and the environment should not know extremism. There are sensible, well-balanced answers to these matters, and we are offering them in this amendment.

I thank the gentleman who have taken the opportunity to get us this far. I admire them for their persistence and patience.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute under consideration, as modified by the Boehlert amendment, because I think the Boehlert amendment and the substitute improve exist-

ing law. I am going to support the bill, as amended.

The bill represents a significant effort to factor environmental interests into the balance, and I compliment the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], for their effort.

First, the problematic section of the State management of coordination areas is resolved by the amendment requiring that management of those areas meet the compatibility standard. We just went through an interesting debate about whether or not 500 acres should come before this House to be authorized, and I think that was clarified and that was debated and more clearly understood.

Finally, my greatest concern is that we remember the reason we have refuges in the first place. First and foremost is for conservation of wildlife and plants. Whether the purpose for that conservation is to provide hunting and fishing opportunities, to preserve endangered species or to save wild spaces so our children in this world can know that there is something more than cars, pavements and sidewalks, this bill, the mission of this bill, is for conservation. The Boehlert amendment insures that compatibility means compatibility with the conservation mission.

Mr. Chairman, the last two Congresses have seen a stalemate on environmental issues which has benefited neither landowners, nor industry, nor environment, nor conservation. We have seen both sides occasionally trip over their hyperbole, and the mistrust that has grown has made consensus impossible.

This admittedly imperfect bill at least contains a tremendous attempt at consensus, and for that reason I believe it deserves our support.

It should come as no surprise that generally, I believe, good science is critical for environmental legislation. I also recognize that good environmental legislation has always been developed by consensus.

The bill before us will do no practical harm to the refuge system, and if it can become the first step toward building a consensus on conservation issues, then it does a tremendous amount of good, and I urge support for the amendment and I urge support for the adoption of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. LINCOLN

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. LINCOLN: At the end of the bill add the following new section:

SEC. —. AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO ACCEPT STATE DONATIONS OF STATE EMPLOYEE SERVICES DURING GOVERNMENT BUDGETARY SHUTDOWN.

After section 2 of the Act, as redesignated by section 11(a)(3) of this Act add the following new section:

"SEC. 3. AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO ACCEPT STATE DONATIONS OF STATE EMPLOYEE SERVICES DURING GOVERNMENT BUDGETARY SHUTDOWN.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accept from any qualified State donations of services of State employees to perform in a refuge, in a period of Government budgetary shutdown, fish- and wildlife-dependent recreation management functions otherwise authorized to be performed by Department of Interior personnel.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—An employee of a State may perform functions under this section only—

"(1) within areas of a refuge that are located in the State; and

"(2) in accordance with an agreement entered into by the Secretary and the Governor of the State under subsection (c).

"(c) AGREEMENTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the Secretary may enter into an agreement in accordance with this subsection with the Governor of any State in which is located any part of a refuge.

"(2) TERMS CONDITIONS.—An agreement under this subsection shall—

"(A) contain provisions to ensure resource and visitor protection acceptable under the standards of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

"(B) require that each individual performing functions under the agreement shall have—

"(i) adequate safety training;

"(ii) knowledge of the terrain in which the individual will perform those functions; and

"(iii) knowledge of and adherence to Federal regulations relating to those functions; and

"(C) specify other terms and conditions under which a State employee may perform such functions.

"(d) EXCLUSION FROM TREATMENT AS FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—A State employee who performs functions under this section shall not be treated as a Federal employee for purposes of any Federal law relating to pay or benefits for Federal employees.

"(e) ANTI-DEFICIENCY ACT NOT APPLICABLE.—Section 1341(a) of title 31, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to the acceptance of services of, and the performance of functions by, State employees under this section.

"(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

"(1) the term 'Government budgetary shutdown' means a period during which there are no amounts available for the operation of the System, because of—

"(A) a failure to enact an annual appropriations bill for the period for the Department of the Interior; and

"(B) a failure to enact a bill (or joint resolution) continuing the availability of appropriations for the Department of the Interior for a temporary period pending the enactment of such an annual appropriations bill; and

"(2) the term 'qualified State' means a State that has entered into an agreement with the Secretary in accordance with subsection (c)."

Mrs. LINCOLN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to H.R. 1675 would alleviate the burdens faced by our constituents during Federal governmental shutdowns.

This Congress has seen two shutdowns that have adversely affected individuals wishing to use our wildlife refuges. In Arkansas, the first shutdown occurred during a 4-day deer hunt and the second occurred right in the middle of duck hunting season. Hunters had scheduled family vacations and purchased hunting permits, only to be turned away from the gates.

This did not need to happen. Officials at the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission volunteered their services when a shutdown was imminent, and had actually signed an agreement with the Fish and Wildlife Service in Atlanta. However, right before the shutdown, Interior Department attorneys determined that this agreement was not allowed under current law.

My amendment fixes this problem. If this language is adopted, States will be able to step in for the Federal Government for all fish- and wildlife-dependent recreational management activities only during governmental shutdowns if they have a prior agreement with the Department of the Interior. This amendment would not allow the States to conduct commercial management functions such as timbering, haying, or grazing. Such agreement would ensure both the protection of the land and the people using the refuge by demanding proper safety training, knowledge of the local terrain and knowledge of the Federal regulations by State employees before they take over Fish and Wildlife Service's duties.

This amendment has the support of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, B.A.S.S., Ducks Unlimited, and the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.

We should never encourage the closure of our Federal Government. However, these shutdowns periodically arise and there should be a plan in place to address such occurrences.

Additionally, because the Federal budget and appropriations process concludes at the end of September, if the Government closes, it oftentimes occurs during the time where the demand for access to these lands for hunting and other recreational activities is quite high. I know that the constituents in the First District of Arkansas look forward to using the refuges during the fall and early winter and many have planned family vacations around the hunting seasons.

Lack of funding for the refuges and reduced access due to Government closures may also jeopardize public sup-

port for the Refuge System. Hunters who have invested a lot of money in the purchase and management of these refuges may look elsewhere for their needs if their access to the lands is diminished or becomes unpredictable.

As my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], stated, I am a strong conservationist and a hunter, and I certainly urge my colleagues to support this simple, commonsense amendment.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and to say that we have looked at this amendment and we do not object to the acceptance of this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN] on this amendment. It is long overdue. The administration supports this amendment. It is something we should have in the tools to make sure that what happened last October, November, December should not occur again because the agency said it could not be done legally. This amendment takes care of that problem.

I strongly support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have carefully reviewed the amendment offered by our distinguished colleague from Arkansas [BLANCHE LAMBERT LINCOLN].

I intend to support this amendment and I compliment our colleague for the many months of hard work she has spent perfecting this language.

Under the terms of this amendment, a State would be able to enter into an agreement with the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of allowing State employees to operate units of our Federal Wildlife Refuge System should, in the unlikely event, a Government budgetary shutdown occur in the future.

These employees will have to receive adequate safety training, be knowledgeable about the terrain of the particular refuge unit, and adhere to all appropriate Federal regulations.

While it is unclear whether these agreements will ever be necessary, it is an innovative approach and it provides the kind of legislative fail-safe that the Secretary should have administratively used last winter to save our States thousands of dollars of lost hunting revenues.

Finally, I am pleased that this language has been expanded to include not only hunting but also fishing, wildlife observation, and environmental education. There are millions of Americans who regularly enjoy these forms of wildlife-dependent recreation, and this amendment will help to ensure that our Nation's refuge doors remain open in the years ahead.

It is my understanding that the administration has no objection to this System-wide solution and I urge an "aye" vote on the Lincoln amendment.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, last year, I stood in this well on several occasions regarding dubious actions taken by the Department of the Interior.

On the first occasion, I was addressing a comment made by Secretary Babbitt in which

he mistakenly referred to my party affiliation. While the Secretary was wrong when he made his statement, as we will know, his prophecy has come to pass.

The second instance during the debate on H.R. 450, the Regulatory Transition Act, dealt with threats by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS] to potentially delay the opening of migratory bird hunting seasons. During the Government shutdowns this winter, the Department of the Interior was at it again—holding hunters and fishermen hostage during the Government shutdown even though many States, like my home State of Louisiana, agreed to keep the Federal wildlife refuges open.

In fact, a satellite office of the USFWS solicited Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries assistance in maintaining smooth operation of Federal refuges in preparation for the first Government shutdown. But, Department of the Interior lawyers in Washington told the State they could not proceed. Clearly, the best interests of the wildlife and recreation on the refuges were being seriously overlooked.

The USFWS also specifically requested that these same State officials promulgate special regulations to extend deer season 2 additional days over the weekend of January 6 and 7 due to the first shutdown. After the State did so at its own expense, those additional days and the importance of hunting to Louisiana's economy were again threatened during the second shutdown by the same Department of Interior lawyers.

This amendment today would clarify the States' authority to rectify the underlying problem leading to these situations.

The Lincoln amendment would require the Secretary of the Interior to accept voluntary services of state employees in the operations of National Wildlife Refuge units during any period of Federal budgetary shutdown for the management of hunting, fishing, and other recreational activities authorized on each refuge. States and the Department of the Interior would have to have an agreement in place prior to any shutdown.

The 17 Federal refuges in Louisiana are an integral part of the over \$630 million in annual direct and indirect revenue that hunting brings into our State's economy. In fact, as much as one-third of the economies of several of the coastal parishes I represent are dependent on tourism related to hunting activities. Without the continued management of these refuges, the very lives and livelihoods of the people in these Parishes are at risk. While I do not advocate the general principle of shutting down the Federal Government, I refuse to allow Secretary Babbitt to jeopardize my constituents and their interests.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the Lincoln amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for purposes of engaging in a colloquy with my dear friend, the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my good friend from Alaska to engage in a colloquy with me with regard to the existing reserve water rights on the national refuge system under H.R. 1675.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that a statement of the committee report on H.R. 1675 would be interpreted by some to mean that this bill eliminates, waives, or concedes existing Federal water rights which currently attach to lands which were previously withdrawn from the public domain from old military bases or from other lands owned by the Federal Government for use as refuges.

The statement I am referring to is on page 11 of the committee report and defines the term refuge under section 3(a) of H.R. 1675.

In particular, this section of the Report states that "Federal reserved water rights do not constitute 'interests' within the meaning of the term 'refuge'." This statement appears to be contrary to the language in Section 7(a) of H.R. 1675 which addresses the status of various water rights under the original 1966 Refuge Administration Act and H.R. 1675. I would like to ask the gentleman from Alaska a series of questions to clarify the intent of the Committee with regard to these matters.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to answer the question and provide clarification of this issue to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, section 8(a) of H.R. 1675 would establish a new subsection 4(n)(1) in the Refuge System Administration Act to address the general question of water rights within the refuge system. This subsection appears to contain two important statements affecting reserved water rights in particular.

First, the subsection contains a disclaimer stating that nothing in H.R. 1675 should be interpreted as creating any new reserved water rights within the refuge system.

Is that an accurate interpretation of the legislation before us?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Yes, this provision of the bill you are referring to is intended to clarify that no new reserved water rights are created for wildlife refuges as a result of the passage of this bill.

Mr. DINGELL. Second, this subsection contains another disclaimer stating that nothing in the bill should be interpreted as affecting any refuge water right in existence on the date of

enactment of H.R. 1675. I interpret this provision to mean that nothing in H.R. 1675, including the definition of "refuge" in section 3(a), is intended to override, cede, or extinguish any refuge reserved water right which may have been previously created by a past land withdrawal for wildlife refuge purposes.

Is that the gentleman's intent and interpretation of this provision as well?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Yes, the gentleman from Michigan is correct. This provision is intended to maintain the status quo with regard to existing reserved water rights in the system, and to clarify that reserved water rights previously created at the time of withdrawal of these lands for refuge purposes will not be expanded nor restricted, diminished, or eliminated due to the passage of H.R. 1675. As a result, refuge reserved water rights will remain exactly in the same position as they are today if H.R. 1675 becomes law.

Mr. DINGELL. I want to thank my good friend, and I have further questions: Therefore, it was the intention of my good friend that the exclusion of reserved water rights in the definition of the word "refuge" in section 3(a) of the substitute bill was designed to limit the geographic boundaries of a given refuge rather than to cede or extinguish any reserved water rights which might otherwise be asserted within the system?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Again, the gentleman from Michigan is absolutely correct. The exclusion of reserved water rights in the definition section of H.R. 1675 is intended to impose a limitation on the geographic boundaries of individual refuges and is not intended to override the disclaimer protecting existing water rights in section 8(a) of this bill.

Mr. DINGELL. Finally, I am concerned that section 5 could be interpreted in a way which may limit or prohibit future Federal action to protect the system by its call for acquisitions under State law. Could the gentleman inform me how this provision would affect the current balance of Federal and State interests in the refuge system?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. This provision in section 5, like the rest of H.R. 1675, is intended to recognize long-established Federal-State relationships. States have traditional primacy regarding the allocation of water resources, and this merely directs the Secretary to use appropriate State forums in those cases where water is to be acquired for refuge units. This section should not be construed to otherwise alter or diminish the interests of the Federal Government as it pertains to ownership of or management authority for the National Wildlife Refuge System.

Mr. DINGELL. I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], my dear friend.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DINGELL was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have some further questions of the gentleman from Alaska, and they relate to the question of open until closed.

Mr. Chairman, since the Resources Committee finished consideration of the legislation before us, considerable confusion has arisen over section 6 of the substitute. Specifically, I am referring to paragraph (3)(a)(2), which specifies that existing and compatible wildlife-dependent uses of a refuge are allowed to continue, on an interim basis, on lands added to the System once the legislation before us is enacted into law.

Would the gentleman please explain to us the intention of this paragraph in section 6?

□ 1630

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this provision is intended to address a longstanding concern about a policy of the Fish and Wildlife Service where new refuge lands are "closed until opened." Accordingly, all pre-existing uses are terminated when land is acquired by the Fish and Wildlife Service. This has created conflict at many refuges where sportsmen accustomed to using these lands suddenly find them closed for an unpredictable amount of time.

The purpose of this paragraph, which inserts new language in section 4(d)(3)(b)(x) of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act, is to create the presumption that when the Fish and Wildlife Service brings new lands into the System, compatible wildlife recreation activities ought to be allowed to continue unless the Secretary makes a determination before the acquisition that such activities are not compatible with the purposes of the System.

Mr. DINGELL. There has been much discussion from interested parties about the fact that any recreational use would be allowed to continue on new refuge lands. Is this a correct reading of the bill?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. No, it is not. This provision applies only to wildlife-dependent use of a refuge. This includes fishing, hunting, wildlife observation and environmental education.

Mr. DINGELL. In that case, other activities such as the use of all-terrain vehicles, jet skis, and other uses are not covered under this provision?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DINGELL. Is it correct to read this "open-until-closed" provision as

applying only to lands brought into the National Wildlife Refuge System after this legislation is enacted?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Yes, the bill states very clearly that only wildlife-dependent uses are permitted to continue only on lands added after the date of enactment of this bill. Wildlife-dependent recreation is expected to occur on existing refuge lands if the Secretary determines that the activities meet three requirements: first, they are consistent with the principles of sound fish and wildlife management; second, they are compatible with the purposes of the System; and third, they are consistent with public safety.

Mr. DINGELL. I am concerned and I want this clear on the Record. It is correct that the Secretary will retain significant discretion regarding the authorization of such activities on existing refuge lands?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Once again, the gentleman is correct. Refuge lands may be closed for any one of three reasons specified in the bill thereby providing the Secretary with appreciable discretion. In essence, we are creating a rebuttable presumption that wildlife-dependent recreation is compatible unless it is contrary to one of these principles. This approach is conceptually the same as articulated by Secretary Babbitt to the Congressional Sportsman's Caucus in September 1994.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to direct the gentleman's attention to the term compatible use. Under section 3 of the bill, concerns have been raised that the definition of "compatible use" will alter the intent and administration of the Refuge Recreation Act of 1962. Will the gentleman please enlighten the House as to his intent with regard to the definition of "compatible use"?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. First, I want to make clear that no provision of H.R. 1675 should be read or interpreted as altering in any way the purposes or administration of the Refuge Recreation Act of 1962. Second, the term "compatible use" is defined in a way that codifies an existing definition used by the Fish and Wildlife Service for many years, using reliable scientific information for reaching compatibility decisions.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alaska who has helped me greatly with the concerns that I have had on this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just in closing would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan. He was the father of the Refuge Act as far as this Congress goes and what occurred in the past. He has been very supportive. His staff has been extremely supportive.

But more than that, JOHN DINGELL has been a true sportsman all through the career I have known him. He has gone to Alaska. He has participated in

Alaska sporting activities. He has seen what can be done and what should be done, and it is truly a conservation award that he should be receiving with this legislation.

What we have done here today is trying to improve the Act to make sure that we gain that support for a bill that has worked very well in the past, a position that can be worked well in the future. This working together can work for the conservation and for the sportsmen of America.

Mr. Chairman, today we are considering a substitute for H.R. 1675, the National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1996. This substitute is the result of many months of hard work and negotiations with the Department of Defense and Interior, interested Members, and many outside groups, and it goes a long way towards resolving concerns the administration had about earlier versions of the bill.

The National Wildlife Refuge System contains 508 wildlife refuges located throughout the United States, and comprises 91.7 million acres of Federal lands. These refuges are multiuse lands that offer recreational opportunities to millions of Americans each year. In fact, fishing and hunting occurs on over half of the refuges, more than 90 percent of the acreage in the System. Nearly 30 million people visit refuges each year to observe wildlife and over 50,000 students enjoy environmental education activities.

Over the last 30 years since the last major refuge reform legislation was enacted, a series of government reports and congressional hearings have found that the System needs a more standardized, centralized management regime. This bill addresses these findings. Under current law—the Refuge Recreation Act of 1962 and the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act of 1966: there is no statutory list of purposes for the National Wildlife Refuge System; there is no statutory definition of what constitutes a "compatible use" of a refuge. As a result, individual refuge managers have broad discretion to prevent certain recreational activities and they are subject to tremendous pressure from various interest groups; refuges are not managed as a national system because of the lack of centralized guidelines from the Fish and Wildlife Service; secondary uses, such as fishing and hunting, are prohibited on new refuge lands until boundary studies, environmental assessments, and management plans are completed. This can take years; when a compatibility determination is made by a refuge manager, the public is denied any opportunity to comment on proposed changes or restrictions; and there is no requirement to complete comprehensive conservation plans for any of the 508 refuges. In fact, the Fish and Wildlife Service admits that it has completed such plans for only a fraction of all refuges.

The Young-Dingell substitute solves these problems. It establishes a nationwide set of purposes for the refuge system. These purposes are: (1) to provide a network of lands and waters to conserve fish, wildlife, and plants and their habitats; (2) to conserve, manage, and restore fish and wildlife populations, plant communities, and refuge habitats; (3) to conserve and manage migratory

birds, interjurisdictional fish species, and marine mammals; (4) to provide opportunities for compatible fish- and wildlife-dependent recreational uses of refuges, including fishing and hunting, wildlife observation, and environmental education; (5) to preserve, restore, and recover threatened or endangered species; and (6) to fulfill international treaty obligations with respect to fish, wildlife, and plants.

The substitute statutorily defines "compatible use" by using the exact language the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has used for many years and is currently found in their operating regulations. While a refuge manager will retain the power to determine what is a "compatible use", this definition should provide the guidance needed to make the proper decision.

The bill allows traditional wildlife-dependent recreation—that is, hunting, fishing, wildlife observation, and environmental education—to continue during the interim period after the acquisition but before the implementation of a management plan.

The author of this "open until closed" provision is the gentleman from New Jersey, JIM SAXTON. It is an essential change because there are a growing number of Americans who are angry and frustrated over the Service's land acquisition process. These Americans have worked hard to protect certain lands, they have contributed millions of dollars to the purchase of refuge lands, and they have found, much to their dismay, that for no rational reason their favorite fishing spot is now off limits during an open-ended period of governmental studies.

This is a wrong-headed policy and I compliment JIM SAXTON for his contribution to restoring confidence to the System.

This bill requires conservation plans for each refuge within 15 years of enactment. It is important that we know what kind of archaeological, natural, or wildlife resources exist on these refuges. This inventory has been a goal of the environmental community for many years.

This substitute bill incorporates the President's March 25, 1996 Wildlife Refuge Executive Order, and his "Directives to the Secretary" are codified in section 5, the Administration of the System.

The substitute stipulates that no funds may be spent from the Land and Water Conservation Fund for the creation of a new wildlife refuge without a specific congressional authorization.

In the past, more than \$1 billion in taxpayer money has been appropriated from this fund to acquire refuge lands. This money has been spent with little oversight from congressional authorizing committees and without the checks and balances of the Migratory Bird Commission. Congress must have a role in this process, and we should authorize new wildlife refuge units just as we authorize new parks, flood control projects, and weapons systems. In this way, private property owners and their tax dollars are well protected.

Finally, this substitute contains a number of other provisions negotiated with the Clinton administration. These include: overflights above a refuge, the eradication of aquatic nuisance species, and language allowing the President to exempt certain activities on military refuge lands because of national security reasons.

Much of the rhetoric surrounding this bill has been at best misleading. So I also want to make clear what this substitute does not do. It does not permit or require hunting and fishing to occur on every wildlife refuge. These activities must be found "compatible" and must meet the three part of being based on sound fish and wildlife management practices, being fully consistent with the fundamental reasons the refuge was created, and not endangering public safety; affect Federal, State, or local water rights. This bill does not limit the ability of the Federal Government to secure water for a refuge; facilitate nonwildlife-dependent uses such as grazing, farming, mining, oil and gas development, jet skiing, et cetera. As under current law, nonwildlife-dependent uses may continue to occur when compatible, and when the Fish and Wildlife Service lacks legal authority or sufficient ownership interest in the property to prevent them. But this bill does not mandate, enhance, or protect such uses; increase or decrease the size of any of the 508 refuge units; permit the pesticides not approved by the Fish and Wildlife Service to be used by row farmers or anyone else in the Refuge System; permit the commercialization of our Refuge System. To repeat, it is limited to wildlife-dependent uses. They are clearly defined as fishing, hunting, wildlife observation, and environmental education; and limit the Fish and Wildlife Service's ability to acquire lands at existing refuges. In fiscal year 1997, the Service proposes to spend \$19.2 million to acquire new acreage for our Refuge System. This provision will not delay, stop, or otherwise affect those acquisitions.

This legislation is the product of many months of hearings, discussions, and revisions. This measure was reported by voice vote by both the subcommittee and the full committee.

This legislation is supported by the American Archery Council, the American Sportfishing Association, B.A.S.S., Inc., the California Waterfowl Association, Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, Foundation for North American Wild Sheep, International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, International Bowhunters Organization, Masters of Foxhounds Association of America, Mzuri Wildlife Foundation, National Rifle Association, National Wild Turkey Federation, New Jersey Federation of Sportsmen, North American Waterfowl Federation, Quail Unlimited, Ruffed Grouse Society, Safari Club International, Wildlife Forever, and the Wildlife Legislative Fund of America. It has also been endorsed by the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, which has a membership of 204 Members of this body.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1675 is a sound piece of conservation legislation that reaffirms the legacy of President Theodore Roosevelt and the vision of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966.

Finally, I want to express my sincere appreciation to the highly distinguished gentleman from Michigan, JOHN DINGELL. Without his dedication, tireless commitment, and leadership, this effort would not have been achievable.

I urge an "Aye" vote on H.R. 1675.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI) having assumed the chair, Mr. GILLMOR, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, (H.R. 1675) to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to improve the management of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 410, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 287, nays 138, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

YEAS—287

Allard	Bono	Coble
Archer	Boucher	Coburn
Armey	Brewster	Collins (GA)
Bachus	Browder	Combest
Baessler	Brown (FL)	Condit
Baker (CA)	Brownback	Cooley
Baker (LA)	Bryant (TN)	Costello
Ballenger	Bunn	Cox
Barcia	Bunning	Cramer
Barr	Burr	Bentsen
Barrett (NE)	Burton	Crapo
Bartlett	Buyer	Creameans
Barton	Callahan	Cubin
Bass	Calvert	Cunningham
Bateman	Camp	Danner
Bereuter	Canady	de la Garza
Bevill	Castle	Deal
Bilbray	Chabot	DeLay
Bilirakis	Chambliss	Diaz-Balart
Bishop	Chapman	Dickey
Bliley	Chenoweth	Dingell
Blute	Christensen	Doolittle
Boehlert	Chrysler	Dornan
Boehner	Clement	Doyle
Bonilla	Clinger	Dreier

Duncan	Kasich	Radanovich
Dunn	Kelly	Rahall
Edwards	Kim	Ramstad
Ehlers	King	Regula
Ehrlich	Kingston	Riggs
Emerson	Kleczka	Roberts
English	Klink	Roemer
Ensign	Klug	Rogers
Everett	Knollenberg	Rohrabacher
Ewing	Kolbe	Ros-Lehtinen
Fawell	LaHood	Roth
Fields (TX)	Largent	Roukema
Flake	Latham	Royce
Flanagan	LaTourette	Salmon
Foley	Laughlin	Sawyer
Fowler	Lewis (CA)	Saxton
Fox	Lewis (KY)	Scarborough
Franks (CT)	Lightfoot	Schaefer
Frisa	Lincoln	Schiff
Funderburk	Linder	Seastrand
Gallegly	Livingston	Sensenbrenner
Ganske	LoBiondo	Shadegg
Gekas	Longley	Shaw
Gephardt	Lucas	Shuster
Geren	Luther	Sisisky
Gilchrest	Manton	Skeen
Gillmor	Manzullo	Skelton
Goodlatte	Martinez	Smith (MI)
Goodling	Mascara	Smith (TX)
Gordon	McColum	Smith (WA)
Goss	McCrery	Solomon
Graham	McHugh	Souder
Green (TX)	McInnis	Spence
Greene (UT)	McIntosh	Spratt
Greenwood	McKeon	Stearns
Gunderson	Metcalfe	Stenholm
Gutknecht	Mica	Stockman
Hall (TX)	Miller (FL)	Stump
Hamilton	Minge	Stupak
Hancock	Mollinari	Talent
Harman	Mollohan	Tanner
Hastert	Montgomery	Tate
Hastings (WA)	Moorhead	Tauzin
Hayes	Murtha	Taylor (MS)
Hayworth	Myers	Taylor (NC)
Hefley	Myrick	Tejeda
Hefner	Nethercutt	Thomas
Heineman	Neumann	Thornberry
Hergert	Ney	Thornton
Hillery	Norwood	Thurman
Hilliard	Nussle	Tiahrt
Hobson	Oberstar	Trafigant
Hoekstra	Obey	Upton
Hoke	Ortiz	Volkmer
Holden	Orton	Vucanovich
Horn	Oxley	Walker
Hostettler	Packard	Walsh
Houghton	Paxon	Wamp
Hoyer	Payne (VA)	Ward
Hunter	Peterson (FL)	Watts (OK)
Hutchinson	Peterson (MN)	Weldon (FL)
Hyde	Petri	Weldon (PA)
Inglis	Pickett	Weller
Istook	Pombo	Whitfield
Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy	Wicker
(TX)	Porter	Williams
Johnson (SD)	Portman	Wise
Johnson, Sam	Poshard	Wolf
Jones	Pryce	Young (AK)
Kanjorski	Quillen	Young (FL)
Kaptur	Quinn	Zeliff

NAYS—138

Abercrombie	Coyne	Franks (NJ)
Andrews	Davis	Frelinghuysen
Baldacci	DeFazio	Frost
Barrett (WI)	DeLauro	Furse
Becerra	Dellums	Gejdenson
Beilenson	Deutsch	Gibbons
Bentsen	Dicks	Gilman
Berman	Dixon	Gonzalez
Bonior	Doggett	Gutierrez
Borski	Dooley	Hall (OH)
Brown (CA)	Durbin	Hastings (FL)
Brown (OH)	Engel	Hinchey
Bryant (TX)	Eshoo	Jackson (IL)
Campbell	Evans	Jacobs
Cardin	Farr	Jefferson
Clay	Fattah	Johnson (CT)
Clayton	Fazio	Johnson, E. B.
Clyburn	Fields (LA)	Johnston
Coleman	Filner	Kennedy (MA)
Collins (IL)	Forbes	Kennedy (RI)
Collins (MI)	Ford	Kennelly
Conyers	Frank (MA)	Kildee

LaFalce	Mink	Shays
Lantos	Moakley	Skaggs
Lazio	Moran	Slaughter
Leach	Morella	Smith (NJ)
Levin	Nadler	Stark
Lewis (GA)	Neal	Stokes
Lipinski	Olver	Studds
Lofgren	Owens	Thompson
Lowey	Pallone	Torkildsen
Maloney	Pastor	Torres
Markey	Payne (NJ)	Torricelli
Martini	Pelosi	Towns
Matsui	Rangel	Velazquez
McCarthy	Reed	Vento
McDermott	Richardson	Visclosky
McHale	Rivers	Waters
McKinney	Rose	Watt (NC)
McNulty	Roybal-Allard	Waxman
Meehan	Rush	White
Meek	Sabo	Woolsey
Menendez	Sanders	Wynn
Meyers	Sanford	Yates
Millender-	Schumer	Zimmer
McDonald	Scott	
Miller (CA)	Serrano	

NOT VOTING—7

Ackerman	McDade	Wilson
Foglietta	Parker	
Hansen	Schroeder	

□ 1656

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. McDade for, with Mr. Ackerman against.

Messrs. FRELINGHUYSEN, DAVIS, CLAY, THOMPSON, MOAKLEY, and LAZIO of New York, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay"

Mr. KLINK and Mrs. CUBIN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 131, House passage of the National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act, H.R. 1675, I inadvertently voted "yea." I had intended to cast a "nay" vote on the legislation.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1675, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1675, NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1995

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the en-

grossment of the bill, H.R. 1675, the Clerk be authorized to make technical and conforming changes as are necessary to reflect the actions of the House on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 4 OF RULE XI WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-535) on the resolution (H. Res. 412) waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1700

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1202

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1202.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4, rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bill earlier today: Senate 735, to deter terrorism, provide justice for victims, provide for an effective death penalty, and for other purposes.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundergan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 175. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

STATEMENT ON ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, today, April 24, marks the 81st anniversary of the unleashing of the Armenian genocide, one of the most horrible events of the 20th century and probably in all of human history.

Mr. Speaker, each year Members of Congress from both the House and Senate take time to honor the memory of the 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children who were slaughtered during the final years of the Ottoman Turkish Empire. I am proud to continue this congressional tradition today. I am joining with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and other Members from both sides in these 5-minute special orders.

Mr. Speaker, between the years 1915 and 1923 in the Ottoman Turkish Empire, there were 1.5 million Armenians slaughtered and another 500,000 forced to leave from their homelands. What happened was not a series of random atrocities but a systematic policy of deportation, separation of family members, slave labor, torture, and murder. Although the killings finally ended in 1923, efforts to erase all traces of the Armenian presence in what is now eastern Turkey continued, such as the changing of geographical names and the destruction of Armenian religious and cultural monuments. This was the first genocide of the 20th century, a precursor to the Nazi Holocaust and the other cases of ethnic cleansing and mass extermination of peoples in our own time. We must call it by its correct name: genocide.

Yet to this day, the Government of Turkey maintains its disgraceful policy of denying that the genocide ever took place. The facts contradict those denials. The historical record, including documented accounts from American eyewitnesses, proves that the rulers of the Ottoman Empire, conceived in the name of Turkish national ideology, planned and carried out a program to eliminate ethnic minorities, especially the Armenians. The record includes the eyewitness accounts of journalists and diplomats on the scene and the eloquent and horrifying testimony of the survivors. The historic record is clear. At that time the word genocide had not yet been coined, but genocide is what it was. Yet there were no Nuremberg trials. There has been no official atonement by the Turkish nation. In fact, statements by me and other Members of Congress about the Armenian genocide are routinely dismissed by Turkey's Ambassador to the United States.

We must continue to persuade Turkey, the recipient of hundreds of millions of dollars each year in United

States aid, to officially acknowledge the truth, and in our own time we must insist that Turkey lift its illegal blockades of Armenia and accept the Armenian government's offer to normalize relations without preconditions.

Just a few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, the Turkish President came to Washington on a state visit. For anyone who has held out the hope that the President would offer an olive branch of reconciliation to the Armenian people, the visit was a major disappointment, though not a major surprise. The Government of Turkey refused to lift the blockade of Armenia and accept the offer of the Government of Armenia to normalize relations without preconditions.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, United States administrations have also avoided using the term genocide in describing what happened 80 years ago, no doubt under heavy pressure from the Government of Turkey. While President Clinton and his predecessors have acknowledged the Armenian people were the victims of tragic massacres, these Presidential statements have never sufficiently conveyed the full extent of the evil that occurred. Clearly this entire shameful and appalling period of history meets every definition of the term genocide.

Earlier this month, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and I, as co-chairmen of the Caucus on Armenian Issues, asked our colleagues to join us in urging the President to make a much stronger statement acknowledging the genocide. Fifty-nine Members of Congress signed on. Last year many of us signed a similar letter. Sadly, although President Clinton last year issued a powerful statement, he carefully avoided the word genocide. I want you to know that I support President Clinton on many issues and he has shown strong support for many pro-Armenian initiatives. He has appointed a special United States negotiator for the Nagorno-Karabagh situation, and the United States Agency for International Development has devoted great resources to Armenia, but I have no problem putting the President on the spot on the question of calling the genocide by its proper name. It is very important and a clear-cut case of doing the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that while the purpose of our ceremony today is a solemn remembrance of a tragedy that affected an entire people, I would like to say a few words about the present and the future. The survivors of the genocide, their sons and daughters and grandchildren, have refused to accept the effort by the Ottoman Turks to destroy the Armenian people. In fact, in the decades since, the Armenian people have flourished.

One of the most inspiring events of recent years has been the emergence of the Republic of Armenia, and we as

Americans must support the Republic of Armenia. It has, through great difficulty, registered positive growth in its gross domestic product. It has moved forward with the process of democratization. It has been having elections.

But the people of Armenia still need our help. They need American help now. Last year, in the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations, again primarily through Congressman PORTER's help, \$85 million in United States humanitarian aid was provided to Armenia, plus an additional \$30 million for development assistance. Last year's foreign operations bill also included the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, which bars aid to Turkey for as long as Turkey blocks the delivery of United States aid to Armenia.

There are a number of things our caucus has been doing, and I am sure other Members tonight will also talk about more of them. But the main thing, Mr. Speaker, is we must continue our support for the Republic of Armenia, improving relations between the two countries, because that is one way that we can make it clear why this genocide, when it took place 80 years ago, was so wrong and what the accomplishments of the Armenian people have been since that time.

Mr. Speaker, today, April 24, 1996, marks the 81st anniversary of the unleashing of the Armenian genocide, one of the most horrible events of the 20th century, and in all of human history.

Each year Members of Congress from both the House and the Senate take time to honor the memory of the 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children who were slaughtered during the final years of the Ottoman Turkish Empire. I am proud to continue this proud congressional tradition today.

I am joining with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and other members from both sides in the aisle in a series of 5-minute special orders to commemorate this tragic anniversary. Other Members are submitting statements in writing testifying to their deep concern about this issue.

Mr. Speaker, between the years 1915 and 1923, in the Ottoman Turkish Empire, 1.5 million Armenians were slaughtered and another 500,000 were forced to leave from their homelands. What happened was not a series of random atrocities, but a systematic policy of deportations, separation of family members, slave labor, torture, and murder. Although the killings finally ended in 1923 efforts to erase all traces of the Armenian presence in what is now eastern Turkey continued, such as the changing of geographical names and the destruction of Armenian religious and cultural monuments. This was the first genocide of the 20th century, a precursor to the Nazi Holocaust and the other case of ethnic cleaning and mass extermination of peoples in our own time. We must call it by its correct name: genocide.

Yet, to this day, the Government of Turkey maintains its disgraceful policy of denying that

the genocide ever took place. But the facts contradict these denials: The historical record, including documented accounts from American eyewitnesses, proves that the rules of the Ottoman Empire conceived, in the name of Turkish nationalist ideology, planned and carried out a program to eliminate ethnic minorities, especially the Armenians. The record includes the eyewitness accounts of journalists and diplomats on the scene, and the eloquent and horrifying testimony of the survivors. The historic record is clear. At that time, the word genocide had not yet been coined, but genocide is what it was. Yet there were no Nuremberg trials. These have been no official atonement by the Turkish nation. In fact, statements by me and other Members of Congress about the Armenian genocide are routinely dismissed by Turkey's Ambassador to the United States.

We must continue to persuade Turkey, the recipient of hundreds of millions of dollars each year in United States aid, to officially acknowledge the truth. And in our own time, we must insist that Turkey lift its illegal blockade of Armenia and accept the Armenian government's offer to normalize relations without preconditions.

Just a few weeks ago, the Turkish President came to Washington on a state visit. For anyone who has held out the hope that President Demirel would offer an olive branch of reconciliation to the Armenian people, the visit was a major disappointment—though not a major surprise. The Government of Turkey refused to lift its blockade of Armenia and to accept the offer of the Government of Armenia to normalize relations without preconditions.

Sadly, United States administrations have also avoided using the term "genocide" in describing what happened 80 years ago—no doubt under heavy pressure from the Government of Turkey. While President Clinton and his predecessors have acknowledged that the Armenian people were the victims of tragic massacres, these Presidential statements have never sufficiently conveyed the full extent of the evil that occurred. Clearly, this entire shameful and appalling period of history meets every definition of the term "genocide."

Earlier this month, Congressman PORTER and I, as co-chairmen of the Caucus on Armenian Issues, asked our colleagues to join us in urging the President to make a much stronger statement acknowledging the genocide. Fifty-nine Members of Congress signed on. Last year, many of us signed a similar letter to the President. Sadly, although President Clinton last year issued a powerful statement, he carefully avoided the word "genocide." I support President Clinton on many issues, and he has shown strong support for many pro-Armenian initiatives. He has appointed a special U.S. negotiator for the Nagorno-Karabagh situation, and the U.S. Agency for International Development [AID] has devoted great resources to Armenia. But I have no problem putting the President on the spot on the question of calling the genocide by its proper name. It is so very important, and such a clear-cut case of doing the right thing.

While the purpose of today's ceremony is a solemn remembrance of a tragedy that affected an entire people, I would like to say a few words about the present and the future.

The survivors of the genocide, their sons and daughters and their grandchildren, have refused to accept the effort by the Ottoman Turks to destroy the Armenian people. In fact, in the decades since, the Armenian people have flourished. The Armenians who came to the United States and their descendants have made tremendous contributions to our business, professional, and cultural life. Armenians have made new lives and significant contributions in many other countries.

One of the most inspiring events of recent years has been the emergence of the Republic of Armenia. Rising out of the ashes of the former Soviet Union, the Republic of Armenia has shown a remarkable resilience, a commitment to democracy and a market economy. And it has not been easy: Armenia has been squeezed by cruel and illegal blockades imposed by modern Armenia's two neighbors, Turkey and Azerbaijan. Some of the noises coming out of Moscow, about a reunited Soviet Union, are most troubling. In spite of these difficulties, Armenia has been the only former Soviet Republic to register positive growth in its gross domestic product. The Republic of Armenia also moves forward with the process of democratization, having held Parliamentary elections last year and planning for Presidential elections this year.

But the people of Armenia need our help—American help—now. We must do everything possible to make sure that they get that assistance, and many of my colleagues are working equally hard.

The foreign operations appropriations for fiscal year 1996 provided \$85 million in U.S. humanitarian aid, plus an additional \$30 million for development assistance. Last year's foreign operations bill also included the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, which bars aid to Turkey for as long as Turkey blocks the delivery of United States aid to Armenia. We are working to have this provision reenacted, and to make sure that the administration strictly enforces this law. In addition, last year's foreign aid bill had a cut in aid to Turkey, as a direct statement of disapproval for Turkey's actions with regards to the Armenian blockade, as well as the mistreatment of the Kurdish people, its occupation of Cyprus and its generally bad human rights record. I find it incredible that a country that gets \$600 million in U.S. taxpayers' funds can get away with blocking the delivery of American humanitarian assistance to its small, struggling neighbor.

Another way we can help Armenia is by ending the illegal blockade imposed by Armenia's neighbor to the east, Azerbaijan. Current U.S. law blocks the provision of American assistance to Azerbaijan until the Azeris lift their blockade. Unfortunately, last year, legislation to waive this law was included in the foreign operations bill. This year, we will try to be more vigilant to make sure that Azerbaijan is not rewarded for failure to comply with the conditions of United States under the Freedom Support Act.

Last year, Congressman PORTER and I founded the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, to be a voice for a stronger United States-Armenia partnership and to better represent the interests of the Armenian-American community. We now have 49 Members, from both parties and all regions of the

country. There is a lot of sympathy and moral support for Armenia in the Congress, in the administration, among state legislators around the country, and among the American people in general. But we should not kid ourselves: we are up against very strong forces, in the State Department and the Pentagon who believe we must continue to appease Turkey, and among United States and international business interests whose concerns with profits and sources of raw materials outweigh their concerns for the people of Armenia.

In closing, let me pay particular tribute to the survivors of the genocide. The horrors you have witnessed and experienced are unspeakable. Yet we must never forget what happened to you, your brothers and sisters, mothers and fathers, friends, and neighbors. I will do all that I can to keep alive the memory of what happened to the Armenian people in the past—and to play a role in working for a brighter future for the Armenian people.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, today, I join in commemoration of the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide. On April 24, 1915, under the direction of the Turkish Ottoman Empire, a campaign of Armenian extermination began. Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders from Istanbul were arrested and exiled—silencing the leading representatives of the Armenian community in the Ottoman Empire. Over the next 8 years, 1.5 million Armenians were murdered, with another 500,000 forced into Russian exile. Today we recognize the struggle of the Armenian people to live peacefully in their historic homeland.

Armenians in the United States and elsewhere should know that their history of suffering has not and will not be ignored. Like the Jewish and Cambodian holocausts, the Armenian genocide stands out as one of the world's most morally reprehensible acts. We need to address and trace the causal factors leading to the rise of totalitarian governments, and ensure that the seeds of fascism are never again planted.

On this day, we should remember those Armenians who died 81 years ago. I have cosponsored House Concurrent Resolution 47, which would put the House on record honoring the memory of the 1.5 million genocide victims. The House should pass this resolution and send a message to the world that we will never forget what happened during that terrible period in history and that we reaffirm our resolve to ensure that no nation will ever again have the opportunity to participate in mass genocide.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues in remembering and paying tribute to the victims of the Armenian genocide. The tragedy of these murders cannot be overestimated—millions lost, a generation of mothers and fathers, children and grandchildren killed. I rise in solidarity with the people of the Armenian-American community, as well as with the people of Armenia, because I feel a connection through tragedy with them. I share that disabling sense of loss that many in the Armenian community feel because I lost members of my family in another Holocaust at the hands of the Nazis. I believe it is vitally important to talk about these heart-breaking events, to keep the spirit of those who died alive for the benefit of the world. And

we must continue to call attention to the horror and the inhumanity of genocide whenever it takes place.

The Armenians who perished at the hands of the young Turk Committee between the years of 1915 and 1923 were people like you and me—they had raised families, worked hard, enjoyed holidays together, had petty arguments, shared joys and sorrows. These people, just like you and me, were killed because of who they were, and even today, 81 years later, this chills us to the bone.

The atrocities began on April 24, 1915, when 200 Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders from Istanbul were arrested and exiled from their community in the Ottoman capital. Over the next 8 years, more than 1 million men, women, and children experienced deportation, forced labor, and in some cases, torture and extermination. This tragedy set the tone for an entire century in which crimes against humanity plague our history books and continue to cover the front page of newspapers.

I am convinced of one thing—the Armenian genocide existed. We know it did. The National Archives holds the most comprehensive documentation in the world on this historic tragedy, over 30,000 pages. More importantly, I have talked with those who survived it. Armenians suffered then, and continue to do so, whenever the atrocity is denied.

I think the most important thing we can do as a nation is acknowledge this tragedy and continue to pay tribute to those Armenians who perished under such terrible circumstances. It is my hope that by preserving these victims and their terrible experiences in our communal memory, we not only honor them, but may even prevent similar situations in the future from occurring.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today, on the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide, I rise to commemorate the lives of the 1.5 million Armenians who were enslaved, tortured and exterminated from 1915 to 1923 by the Ottoman Empire.

On this day in 1915, Armenian intellectuals, clergy and leaders were rounded up and taken to their deaths. What was to follow was the ethnic cleansing of the native homeland of the Armenian people. Over a period of 8 years, 1.5 million Armenians were murdered and another 500,000 were deported. Before World War I, over 2 million Armenians lived in the Ottoman Empire. By 1923, the entire population of Anatolia and Western Armenia had been killed or deported.

This was the first genocide of the 20th century, and, tragically, it was not the last. Prior to the invasion of Poland, Adolf Hitler asked, "Who today remembers the extermination of the Armenians?" In a climate where no one remembered, the death camps became a reality.

Today, as the slaughter continues in Bosnia and Rwanda, it is more important than ever to remember—and to stand up to oppose genocide, systematic extermination, or ethnic cleansing. I have cosponsored H. Con Res. 47, a resolution commemorating the Armenian genocide, because of my belief that we must never forget the victims of this terrible act, and that we must always be prepared to prevent further crimes against humanity.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, one of the most profound calls to action ever written emerged from the Holocaust. Martin Niemöller expressed so well the guilty anguish of silence:

First they came for the Socialists, and I did not speak out because I was not a socialist.

Then they came for the trade unionists, and I did not speak out because I was not a trade unionist.

Then they came for the Jews, and I did not speak because I was not a Jew.

Then they came for me and there was no one left to speak for me.

This quote is telling because it can be said as much for the Armenian genocide as the Jewish Holocaust.

In fact, it has not been lost on historians of this century that the failure to recognize the Armenian genocide for what it was made it easier, not harder, for evil men like Hitler to believe they could do the same.

Today we in Congress are solemnly observing the tragedy of the Armenian genocide.

By observing this event we honor the bravery and courage of those who survived and we honor the memory of those who perished.

By observing this event we take a small step toward ensuring that such horrors will never occur again.

I am honored today to rise on behalf of Rhode Island's Armenian community—a vital and dynamic group that has made an incalculable contribution to the life of my State.

During my years in the Rhode Island General Assembly I joined my colleagues in consistently passing resolutions commemorating the Armenian genocide.

Additionally, we passed a resolution that condemned the removal of a photograph from the Ellis Island Museum which depicted horrors visited upon Armenians. Rhode Island was the first State in the Nation to issue such a resolution.

We can not erase the past by hiding it. We can not make today better by ignoring yesterday. While history may not be pleasant, it is grossly irresponsible to refuse to face the past and all the truths it contains. This photo was restored and visitors were allowed to see the past and learn from history.

As has often been remarked, those who forget the past are condemned to repeat it. Because of that ever-present risk we must all work to always remember and never forget the genocide, to cherish and preserve the Armenian culture, and to continue to fight for human rights and peace in this region.

Not until all Armenians are safe and secure, protected from harm and threat, will our work be done. Not until that day will our cause be won.

Not until that day can we rest.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Each year, I join my House colleagues from both sides of the aisle in remembering the terrible atrocities that have been committed by Turkey against the Armenian people.

Members of Congress rise in this chamber every spring to publicly remember the genocide, but far too often these words and speeches are quickly forgotten. Far too often, people want nothing more than to forget that

mankind can be so cruel. Far too often, people whisper quietly in the dark among themselves about how such a terrible thing as the Armenian genocide could never happen again.

Mr. Speaker, those people who whisper such words are wrong, terribly wrong. First, I would like to talk about how the Armenian genocide began. It began on April 24, 1915, when over 400 religious, political, and intellectual leaders of the Armenian community in Constantinople were executed by the Turkish Government. Thus began a war of ethnic genocide by the Ottoman Empire against Armenians that finally ended in 1923, when over half of the world's Armenian population—an estimated 1.5 million men, women, and children—had been killed. By the end of 1923, virtually the entire Armenian population of Anatolia and western Armenia was dead.

While it is important to remember this horrible fact of history in order to help comfort the survivors, we must also remain eternally vigilant in order to protect Armenia from new and more hostile aggressors. Even now, as we rise to commemorate the accomplishments of the Armenian people and mourn the tragedies they have suffered, Turkey and other countries are attempting to break Armenia down by maintaining a crushing and total blockade against this free nation.

For five consecutive years, Turkey and the former Soviet Republic of Azerbaijan have maintained a blockade of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabagh. The blockade has cut off the transport of food, fuel, medicine, and all other commodities. The blockade has driven over 90 percent of Armenia's population below a poverty level of \$1.00 a day. As many as one-fifth of Armenia's 3.6 million people have fled the country. Because of the ongoing blockade and long winters without heat, thousands of Armenians have died from the harsh cold. These deaths are on Turkish hands, just as the deaths of 1.5 million Armenians earlier this century are on Turkish hands.

Last year, I led the fight in the House of Representatives to protect Armenia from this vicious blockade by Turkey and Azerbaijan by stripping out a provision in the fiscal year 1996 Foreign Operations appropriations bill that would have allowed the United States Government to provide direct cash payments to the Government of Azerbaijan before Azerbaijan had lifted its blockade of Armenia.

My amendment was approved by a voice vote, demonstrating widespread bipartisan support among House members for maintaining the strict sanctions against the Azerbaijani Government. There were over 2 hours of debate on the amendment, during which both Republicans and Democrats spoke strongly in favor of keeping prior U.S. law in place.

Although it has suffered greatly, Armenia is once again a sovereign, independent country. Its people are strong and determined to succeed. I am proud to support Armenia and the many noble ideals it represents. It is my sincere hope that the United States continues to strengthen its relationship with the nation and the people of Armenia.

Towards that end, I am extremely pleased that a strong and vibrant Armenian-American community is flourishing in northwest Indiana. In fact, my predecessor in the House of Representatives, the late Adam Benjamin, was of

Armenian heritage. There are still strong ties to the Armenian homeland among Armenian-Americans. During the devastating Armenian winter of 1992–1993, Mrs. Vicki Hovanessian and her husband, Dr. Raffy Hovanessian, residents of Indiana's First Congressional district, helped to raise over \$750,000 for purchases of winter rescue supplies of heating fuel and foodstuffs. In the last 12 months, alone, the Hovanessians have raised over \$1,000,000 for charitable and educational purposes in Armenia and the United States. Two other Armenian families in my congressional district, Heratch and Sonya Doumanian and Ara and Rosy Yeretsian, have also contributed countless hours and resources toward charitable works in the United States and Armenia. One of the notable causes for which they have worked is the Saint Nerses Seminary in New York, which sponsors an exchange program between the United States and Armenia for new seminarians. I commend these generous families for their hard work and dedication to charitable giving.

In closing, I would like to commend my colleagues, Representatives PORTER and PALLONE, for organizing this special order to commemorate the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide. This remembrance will not only console the survivors and their families, but it may also serve to avert future atrocities.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, this is a solemn day in the history of the modern world. Eighty-one years ago today began a period of systematic persecution of the Armenian people—what would become one of the more terrible cases of state-sponsored terrorism against an ethnic group.

Beginning with the execution of some 200 leaders from the Armenian community on April 24, 1915, Armenians in Turkey were subjected to cruel and brutal treatment. Those of Armenian descent serving in the Ottoman army were subjected to forced labor and later executed. Women were raped or forced into prostitution. Thousands of men, women, and children were forced to leave their villages and either killed outright or sent on death marches through the desert, where they suffered horribly from disease and starvation.

When it was all over, nearly 10 years later, 1½ million Armenians were dead—victims of torture, executions, and forced labor—and hundreds of thousands of others were refugees. The terrible results of this systematic persecution can still be seen today: where once over 2 million Armenians lived in Ottoman Turkey, less than 80,000 live in the region today.

Many years have passed since the Armenian genocide, but we must never forget what happened to the Armenians of Ottoman Turkey solely because of their ethnicity. We must make sure that our children, and their children, learn about the genocide and understand the circumstances which led to such a horrific event in history.

In remembering the millions who died so tragically and unnecessarily, we would be well to remind ourselves of what the terrible effects of racism and bigotry can be. When a nation sees political gain in supporting ethnic persecution, as Ottoman Turkey did in persecuting the Armenian people, the result can only be disaster and tragedy.

We must also remember that individual cases of persecution are often followed by more extreme measures. The Armenian genocide of 1915–1923 had followed decades of anti-Armenian persecution in Ottoman Turkey.

For these reasons, we must never, never tolerate discrimination or bigotry in any form, whether it comes from a single individual or a whole government. We must work together to ensure that such a horrible tragedy as befell the Armenian people never happens again.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand and join with my colleagues in commemorating the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide. I would like to thank the other members of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, and particularly the cochairmen, Mr. PORTER and Mr. PALLONE, for their tireless efforts in organizing this fitting tribute.

On April 24, 1915, 81 years ago today, the nightmare in Armenia began. Hundreds of Armenian religious, political, and educational leaders were arrested, exiled, and murdered. These events marked the beginning of the systematic execution of the Armenian people by the Ottoman Empire, and also launched the first genocide of the 20th century. Over the next 8 years, 1.5 million Armenians were put to their deaths and more than 500,000 more were exiled from their homes. The details of these atrocities are among the most cruel and inhumane acts that have ever been recorded.

As we reflect today on the horrors that were initiated 81 years ago, I cannot help but be disturbed by the forces who wish to discredit or deny that these deeds occurred. Despite the overwhelming evidence to the contrary—eyewitness accounts, official archives, photographic evidence, diplomatic reports, and testimony of survivors—they reject the claim that genocide, or any other crime for that matter, was perpetrated against Armenians. Well, History tells a different story.

Let me read a quote from Henry Morgenthau, Sr., United States Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire at the time, which helps to set the record straight. He said, "When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race; they understood this well, and, in their conversations with me, they made no particular attempt to conceal the fact * * *."

The world knows the truth about this sad episode of human affairs. We will not allow those who wish to rewrite history to absolve themselves from responsibility for their actions. This evening's event here in the House of Representatives is testament to that fact. I would like to once again thank the organizers of this event and I would like to once again reaffirm my sincere thanks for being given the opportunity to participate in this solemn remembrance.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join my colleagues today in remembering and honoring the 1½ million Armenians who were victims of a brutal campaign of genocide between 1915 and 1923 by the Ottoman Empire and its successor state.

This systematic campaign of murder and forced exile is one of the darkest events in this century, and as we recognize it we should also vow to do whatever we can to help prevent such atrocities again.

Today, we honor those who fell in the Armenian genocide. But we also honor the spirit of perseverance and courage that has enabled Armenians to transcend such horrible destruction by surviving not only as individuals but also as a vital people.

Eighty years after the onset of the genocide, Armenia is an independent, democratic state. It was the first among the former Soviet republics to privatize agricultural land and livestock production, and it is working hard to build a strong economy despite tremendous obstacles, both natural and manmade. The 1988 earthquake continues to leave deep scars, and the blockade of Armenia's rail lines and roads has severely limited international trade. Turkey's refusal to allow humanitarian relief to pass through its territory to Armenia also has taken a tragic human toll.

Armenians time and again have displayed enormous courage in the face of adversity, and it is that quality that we commemorate the most here today, even as we honor those Armenians who suffered the evil of the genocide eight decades ago.

Ms. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, today we mourn the 1.5 million victims of an unspeakable 8-year genocide carried out 81 years ago.

From 1915 to 1923, over 1.5 million Armenians living in Turkey were systematically murdered by the Ottoman Empire. And, throughout history, the world has experienced other horrible acts of cruelty such as the killing of 12 million in the Holocaust, ethnic cleansing/tribal warfare in Bosnia and Rwanda and, most recently, the bombing in Oklahoma City. That is why it is so important for us to remember this senseless tragedy every year—so that we remain vigilant in our efforts to promote peace and democracy throughout the world in order to help prevent such atrocious crimes from repeating themselves. Only by remembering such heinous acts can we move forward as a nation.

As we pay tribute to those Armenians who lost their lives, we must also continue to denounce racism, sexism, anti-semitism, bigotry, religious persecution, and ethnic violence both in the United States and throughout the world. And, taking the necessary steps to eradicate these prejudices will allow us to celebrate the many contributions that all groups of people have made to our country.

As the world took steps to end the tremendous suffering endured over 80 years ago, thousands of Armenians came to the United States in search of better lives. Today, they, their children, and their children's children represent what is best in America. Having one of this Nation's largest Armenian community's in my district, I am proud to say that their strong sense of work ethic and family values, among other things, is a model for other families to follow.

But, despite everything that has been achieved over the past 81 years, we cannot forget the plight that Armenia continues to face. In the middle of the Nagorno-Karabagh conflict, Armenia finds itself in a struggle for survival. Not only must the international community continue to increase its efforts to bring about democracy and stability in the TransCaucasus, but the United States must also must continue its resolve to restore secu-

rity in the region and cleanse it of ethnic hatred.

All of us will forever remember this horrible tragedy. But, by working together with other countries to resolve present international conflicts, we will hopefully never have to speak about a similar tragedy in the future.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues once again in remembrance of the Armenian genocide.

In commemorating this terrible human tragedy, it is important for us to remember other such tragedies that have occurred throughout history. In recent years, the horrifying reports of systematic ethnic cleansing and other atrocities in the war-ravaged former Yugoslavia have demanded the attention and response of the Western world. The Balkan conflict has proven to be a very powerful and chilling reminder that if such aggression is ignored, an event much like the Jewish Holocaust can all too easily occur again.

The events of the Balkan conflict have brought the Jewish Holocaust back to the center of human consciousness regarding the history of human tragedies and genocide. While it is important to remember that tragedy, we must not forget that Adolf Hitler's plan for the final solution was rooted in the Armenian genocide. Today, we must remember the Armenian genocide and reflect upon the suffering endured by Armenia and her people.

One and one-half million Armenian people were massacred by the Ottoman Turkish Empire between 1915 and 1923. More than 500,000 Armenians were exiled from a homeland that their ancestors had occupied for more than 3,000 years. A race of people was nearly eliminated.

However great the loss of human life and homeland that occurred during the genocide, a greater tragedy would be to forget that the Armenian genocide ever happened. Adolf Hitler, predicted that no one would remember the atrocities and human suffering endured by the Armenians, years prior to unleashing his plans for the Jewish Holocaust. After all, he claimed, "Who remembers the Armenians?" Our statements today are intended to preserve the memory of the Armenian loss, and to remind the world that the Turkish Government—to this day—refuses to acknowledge the Armenian genocide.

The 81st anniversary also brings to my mind the current plight of the Armenian people, who are still immersed in tragedy and violence. The unrest between Armenian and Azerbaijan continues in the enclave of Nagorno-Karabagh. Thousands of innocent people have already perished in this dispute, and still many more have been displaced and are homeless. In fact, families from my own district in central California have become tragically involved in this conflict.

In the face of this difficult situation comes an opportunity for reconciliation. Now is the time for Armenia and its neighbors, including Turkey, to come together, to work toward a sustaining peace and to rebuild relationships between countries. The first step, must be to recognize the facts of history, however painful or awkward that may be.

Meanwhile, in America, the Armenian-American community continues to thrive and to provide assistance and solidarity to its countrymen and women abroad. Now numbering

nearly one million, the Armenian-American community is bound together by strong generational and family ties, an enduring work ethic and a proud tradition of ethnic heritage. Today we recall the tragedy of their past, not to place blame, but to answer a fundamental question, "Who remembers the Armenians?"

Today our commemoration of the Armenian genocide speaks directly to that end, and I answer—We do.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of the victims of the Armenian genocide.

Today is the 81st anniversary of the beginning of the genocide that ultimately took the lives of one-and-a-half million Armenian men, women and children. On April 24, 1915, 200 Armenian religious, intellectual and political leaders in Constantinople were arrested by the Government of the Ottoman Empire and murdered. It was the beginning of the first genocide of the 20th century, and it continued until 1923. It was a vicious, organized crime against humanity that included murder, deportation, torture and slave labor.

The permanent exhibition of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, just a few blocks from here, contains an excerpt from a speech by Adolf Hitler which says: "Who after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?" Mr. Speaker, that is why we must speak today about the Armenian genocide of 1915–23. So that no individual or government can ever think that such a crime against humanity will be forgotten. By commemorating the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide we bring attention to an atrocity that most of the world knows very little about. It is a part of history that must not be forgotten.

The Armenian genocide was followed by a concerted effort to destroy any record of the Armenians in Asia Minor, including the destruction of religious and cultural monuments, and the changing of place names. I am saddened that there are those who would prefer to forget the Armenian genocide. To ignore it is to desecrate the memory of those who lost their lives. And such denial sends the message that genocide will be tolerated by the world.

To deny the genocide of the Armenians, or any atrocity of this scale, is to forsake the value we place on human life and the principles of liberty upon which this country is based. Those who turn a deaf ear to the Armenian genocide, knowingly or unknowingly, abet the future of genocide by failing to raise public consciousness about this tragic reality.

As we remember those whose lives were brutally taken during the Armenian genocide, we also pay tribute to the survivors—the living testimony of this historic crime—and to their families, many of whom are now Armenian-Americans. We must assure them that we, as the leaders of the democratic world, will not forget this tragedy, but rather gain the wisdom and knowledge necessary to ensure that we can prevent its repetition.

The surest way to honor the memory of the victims of the Armenian genocide and all crimes against humanity is to recognize their suffering and ensure that these acts are never repeated. As we pause to reflect upon this grievous example of man's inhumanity to man,

let us strengthen our conviction that such atrocities never be allowed to happen again.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, on this solemn day of remembrance I join Armenians throughout the United States and around the world in commemorating the genocide of innocent Armenian men, women, and children slaughtered with ruthless precision during the closing days of the Ottoman Empire. It is crucial that we recall the chilling events of this dark chapter in world history, face the historical facts directly and without hesitation, and dedicate ourselves to preventing such atrocities in the future.

The historical record shows that in 1915, a systematic massacre of Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders began. Continuing until 1923, the cruelty and ruthlessness which marked this campaign of terror still shock the conscience more than 80 years later. Between 1915 and 1923, 1.5 million Armenians lost their lives, and more than 500 thousand were expelled from their homes. Innocent Armenians were rounded up and sent away to unknown destinations to be murdered. Uncovered by a researcher only a few years ago, a report from a United States consul stationed in eastern Turkey from 1914 to 1917 provides disturbing details of this coordinated effort to commit genocide against the Armenian people. This record of cold-blooded murder is harrowing.

Despite the calculated attempt to purge the Armenian people from their land and erase Armenian culture and traditions, today the Republic of Armenia is working to establish a vital and progressive nation built upon democratic institutions. The Armenian Government has drafted a constitution, launched a program of industrial reform, privatized agricultural land, and made substantial progress in small-enterprise privatization. Armenia also has taken steps toward resolving the Karabakh conflict and moved to stabilize its economy based upon free-market principles.

I am pleased that our Government has recognized the importance of Armenia and has been working closely with international lending institutions to help ease Armenia's transition to a market economy. Through a comprehensive assistance program, USAID has funded numerous initiatives in Armenia, including one aimed at improving the distribution of much-needed commodities such as kerosene. Armenia has cooperated with the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, made the difficult fiscal decisions necessary to construct a market-based economy, and steadily progressed towards a free and open democratic system.

As we mark the anniversary of the Armenian genocide, we join with our Armenian friends in remembering those who lost their lives in the early years of this century. While we reflect upon the past and dedicate ourselves to preserving the history of this humanitarian disaster, we also look forward. We look forward to a future in which Armenia will, we hope, grow prosperous, achieve economic strength, and, above all else, enjoy peace.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in commemoration of the Armenian genocide.

The genocide committed against the Armenian people in the late 19th century and the early years of our own ranks among the worst

such occurrences in human history. That it took place during the supposedly civilized "modern" era makes the crime all the more abysmal—and the need to commemorate it that much more important. The essential features of the story can be summarized briefly. As the 19th century drew to a close, authorities in the crumbling Ottoman Empire decided to crack down against a growing movement for Armenian autonomy. After enduring brutal persecution, the Armenians refused to pay the taxes levied by their oppressors. As a result, thousands of innocent civilians lost their lives and thousands more witnessed the destruction of their homes—all because the Ottoman Government wanted to teach them a lesson.

When the Armenians sought to publicize their plight by seizing a government building in Constantinople, government forces instigated a vicious pogrom during which over 50,000 perished. Several years later during the First World War, Armenian service in the Allied cause prompted the Turkish authorities to order the deportation of almost the entire Armenian population from their homeland to two distant provinces of the Turkish Empire, Syria and Palestine. Well over 1 million died during this long forced march, many thousands at the hands of government soldiers and many more from disease and malnutrition.

Sadly, we have not managed to escape the consequences of these atrocities. The legacy of bitterness is readily observable in central Asia, where memories of past injustice have complicated the search for peace and stability in Nagorno-Karabakh. The Humanitarian Corridor Act is another echo of the tragedy that occurred so many years ago. We would have had less reason to prepare such legislation if we did not also have to deal with ethnic conflict in the Caucasus.

One bright element did emerge from what befell the Armenians. As the horror continued, thousands of Armenians came to this country; many of their heirs now live in my own State of California, where they have established an enviable record of prosperity and service to the United States and to the broader world community. To them, we all owe a considerable debt of gratitude.

The achievements of Armenian-Americans demonstrate once more that it is possible to pay homage to one's ancestors while rising above the traumas of the past and embracing the opportunities of the here and now. This spirit is one element—no doubt, an essential one—of the American genius. Let us pray that it begins to animate all the people of the Caucasus region. Without a willingness among all parties to put aside ancient feuds while working jointly to resolve the problems of the present day, it will be impossible for the region to achieve even half of what Armenian-Americans have managed to do in less than a century.

Mr. Speaker, please permit me to close by altering slightly what I said at the outset. Even though this is indeed a day of commemoration for the thousands who perished in the Armenian genocide, we must not forget the great duty of those now living to prepare a better world for generations to come.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss genocide. According to the Genocide Convention, genocide constitutes killings and

other acts done "with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group." Genocide has occurred throughout history. Genocide is a crime that has been committed far too many times than we want to acknowledge. It has been committed by many peoples against those perceived as ethnically or religiously different. Many of its perpetrators have gone unpunished; many of its victims have gone unrecognized.

We are immediately reminded of the genocide committed by the Nazi Germans against the European Jews during World War II. Mournful remembrance of its 6 million victims was commemorated by this body this past week. Less known is the genocide committed by the Nazi Germans against the Slavic peoples during World War II. More recently, we are reminded of the genocide committed by the Hutus against the Tutsis in Rwanda beginning April 6, 1994. One million were estimated killed; 2 million were forced to flee to neighboring countries. Neither can we forget the genocide committed during the past 5 years by the Orthodox Christian Serbs against the Muslim Slavs in the former Yugoslavia. The total number dead and homeless have yet to be determined. In addition to these, we need to be reminded of another—the genocide of Armenians by the Ottoman Turks, which occurred between 1915 and 1923. Although this persecution claimed the lives of 1.5 million people and resulted in the forced deportation of 500,000 people, too few of us are even aware of its occurrence.

The Genocide Convention entered into force January 12, 1951. It was ratified by the United States on February 23, 1989. It confirms that "genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law." The convention recognizes that every nation in the world has an obligation "to prevent and punish" genocide. As a world power, the United States must do whatever it can to ensure that perpetrators of genocide are brought to justice and to ensure that genocide never happens again. As representatives of the American people, we must speak out and condemn genocide wherever it has occurred. Each of us, individually and collectively, has a moral obligation to acknowledge the wrongs of the past and to ensure that they are never again allowed to occur.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, April 24 marks the commemoration of the massacre of Armenians in Turkey during and after the First World War. In what historians refer to as the first of this century's state-ordered genocides against a minority group, more than 1.5 million people were murdered. We mourn the dead and express our condolences to the descendants of those who perished. We must also reflect upon the meaning and lessons of their suffering and sacrifice.

As many have observed, the massacres and deportations inflicted upon the Armenian community during that period were to mark this century of horrors. Civilian populations, defined by ethnic, racial, or religious distinctiveness, have become the objects of persecution and genocide simply because of who they are—Armenian Christians, European Jews, Bosnian Muslims. The range of victims—geographical, ethnic, religious, and political—testifies to the universality of human cruelty and

fanaticism. The response of the survivors, however, testifies to the indestructibility and the resilience of the human spirit, even in the face of the most virulent evil.

Like the phoenix of mythology, the Armenian people survived its bleakest days and arose with renewed vigor. Armenians' sense of national identity has been strengthened and the Armenian language is flourishing. Most important, independent Armenian statehood has been restored to guarantee the security and future of the nation. However, independent Armenia, the realized promise and the living memorial to the victims of 1915 and later years, has endured a difficult rebirth. The Nagorno-Karabakh conflict has cost thousands of lives, created hundreds of thousands of refugees, and kept the entire region from enjoying the blessings of independence. Blockaded by its neighbors, Armenia's people have suffered through cold, hunger and deprivation. But their spirit remains sturdy, and their sacrifices link them in an unbreakable bond with past generations of Armenians.

It is our fervent hope, Mr. Speaker, that future generations will not have to sacrifice as their ancestors have. It is also our hope that all parties to the conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh will build on the now 2-year-old cease-fire and renew their efforts through the OSCE process to reach a negotiated settlement. Nothing could honor the memory of the victims of 1915 more than a free, prosperous Armenia living in peace with all its neighbors, and moving and impressing the world with both the spiritual and material products of the unbreakable Armenian spirit.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to Mr. PALLONE and Mr. PORTER for holding this special order today to commemorate the Armenian genocide.

Approximately 6 million people of Armenian descent live in the United States. The elderly among them still have memories of the systematic persecution of Armenians during the years of the Ottoman Empire, and the accounts of this terrible crime against humanity have been passed down through the generations.

It is impossible to comprehend all of the genocidal horrors that were perpetrated against the Armenians during this dark time. In a few short years, approximately 1½ million ethnic Armenians were killed. Another one-half million were driven from their homes, robbed of their property, and saw every sign and symbol of their religion and culture obliterated and replaced with Turkish nationalist symbols.

Journalist Marjorie Hagopian reported that when the Nazis contemplated the destruction of the Jewish people, one of the leaders asked whether or not there would be world repercussions for the planned atrocities. Hitler is said to have responded, "Who cared about the Armenians?"

Would that the moral outrage of past atrocities against Armenians, Jews, Romanys—gypsies, gays, labor leaders, intellectuals, and clergy prevent any such occurrence again. Sadly, even today we see in the former Yugoslavia gross violations of human rights, "ethnic cleansing," massive forced relocation of populations, and other horrors for which the Armenian genocide was a horrible precedent.

April 24 has been set aside to remind us of George Santayana's prophetic warning that

those who forget history are doomed to repeat it. Today we honor the memory of the victims of the Armenian genocide and reaffirm our unwavering commitment to fight all crimes against humanity.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide of 1915 to 1923 and pay tribute to the more than 1.5 million Armenians killed by the Turkish Ottoman Empire. I commend my colleagues, Congressman PORTER and Congressman PALLONE, for arranging this special order to observe this horrific event in world history.

On April 24, 81 years ago, the Ottoman Turkish Government launched their systematic and deliberate campaign of genocide against the Armenian people. This violent campaign resulted in the deaths of over one-third of the Armenian population living in the Ottoman Empire and the exile of approximately 500,000 Armenians from their homeland.

Unfortunately, the persecution of the Armenians did not end in 1923, but continues today. Since 1988, the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict involving Armenia and Azerbaijan, has left more than 1,500 Armenians dead and hundreds of thousands of refugees in the three territories. A withering blockade of economic disruption has made everyday life a struggle for Armenians. Acquiring necessities for survival has become a great obstacle.

As a member of the congressional Armenian caucus, I have been working with my colleagues on the caucus on issues which effect the Armenian community. Recently, I joined my colleagues in sending the President a letter asking him to join the congressional Armenian caucus to issue a strong statement of commemoration and to honor the memory of the survivors of the Armenian genocide. In addition, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 47, honoring the memory of the victims of the Armenian genocide. It calls for the United States to encourage the Republic of Turkey to acknowledge and commemorate the atrocity committed against the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire from 1915 to 1923.

New York State is one of the few States which has offered a human rights/genocide curricula for teachers to use at their discretion, which includes the story of the Armenian genocide. Educational programs such as this will allow our children to learn about the tragic past in Armenian history, ensuring a peaceful existence for future generations.

It is my hope that next year when we remember the 82d anniversary of Armenian Martyrs Day we will be able to celebrate a restored peace to the Armenian people and confidently proclaim that "never again" will the world allow such a senseless tragedy to occur.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, there is a well-worn saying that "Time heals all wounds." As we reflected this past weekend on the one-year anniversary of the tragedy in Oklahoma City, we drew some solace from it. Mercifully, the immediate pain and sadness of that most horrendous American terrorist act in history have passed. However, while we draw comfort from the passing of time, it does not mean that we are expected or should forget.

This is an especially poignant time to recall another horrible act of hate and evil, the genocide committed against the Armenian people

in Turkey 81 years ago. Just as we will never forget the terrorism committed in Oklahoma, it is important that we not forget the 1.5 million Armenian men and women and children who were brutally murdered in the inaugural genocide of the 20th century.

Each year, Americans, and not just Armenian-Americans, come together on this occasion. We do so to do more than simply remember that the Armenians were the first victims of what sadly has become man's bloodiest century. Rather, we each hope that raising the consciousness of past atrocities helps prevent similar tragedies in the future.

With tragedy so near and so fresh in our minds, we are easily reminded that hate and evil are unfortunate aspects of the human condition. However, it is our responsibility as Americans to remain vigilant against hate, violence, and intolerance, whenever and wherever it rears its ugly head.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues for this commemoration, and I thank Mr. PORTER and Mr. PALLONE for arranging it.

Recent history has seen the Armenian people subjected to a number of very difficult, troubling and tragic circumstances. From being forced to live under the Soviet communist regime, to the terrible 1988 earthquake—much worse than any this Nation has ever seen, to the present blockade and violence imposed by the Azeris.

The Armenian people have long suffered.

But nothing is more tragic than the genocide which took place from 1915 to 1923. One and one-half million died, countless more lost mothers and fathers, sons and daughters, uncles and aunts, comrades and friends.

We stand here, more than half a century later, to ensure that others will not forget.

Not forget the massacres. Not forget the persecution. Not forget the death marches. Not forget the bloodshed. And not forget that all citizens in the world deserve to live in freedom without the threat of destruction by people that hate.

That is why it is important we commemorate this 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide. We can not afford to let the people of this world forget that genocide can, and does happen. Already, this decade has been marred by events in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia.

In light of the sorry events in those countries we must do everything in our power to make sure the people of the world remember the genocide in Armenia 81 years ago. For, if we forget the past we will be condemned to repeat it.

As part of this effort the distinguished minority whip, Congressman BONIOR and I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 47. This resolution would put the House on record honoring the memory of the 1.5 million genocide victims. The House must pass this resolution and send a message to the world that we can never forget.

Furthermore, we are hosting a congressional reception next week and encourage all Members to take a moment out of their schedules to honor the survivors and the memories of the victims of this dark event in world history.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to join today in the special order organized by my colleagues, Congressman JOHN PORTER and Congressman FRANK PALLONE, to honor the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide. It has in fact been my privilege to participate in such observances throughout the time that I have served in the U.S. Congress.

Eighty-one years is certainly a long time, but the memory of the atrocities committed by the former Ottoman Empire at that time against those of Armenian descent still burns in the consciousness of Armenian-Americans. This is indeed an important occasion, not just for Armenian-Americans, but for all those concerned by human rights abuses and by campaigns of genocide.

Our observance of this anniversary can serve as a reminder that such atrocities will not be forgotten. That, in itself, is very important. It is also equally important, however, to take this opportunity to think of those innocent men, women, and children who fell victim to this genocidal campaign in 1915 and the years immediately following. Their lives were abruptly ended—in a brutal and revolting manner—but they can come to life in our memories each year at this time. Those of their descendants who migrated to the United States after this terrible event still carry the memory of these unfortunate victims on this day and every day, and I believe that their ancestors would be proud to know how those who lived through this terrible event worked hard to make a new, prosperous life as citizens of their adopted land, the United States of America—and how they worked hard to keep their memory alive.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I thank my colleagues for arranging this special order on this important anniversary.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues tonight in commemorating the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide. It is a testament to the Members of the Chamber that year after year we stand in the well of the House and pay tribute to the memory of the 1.5 million Armenian who were systematically slaughtered by the Ottoman Turks from 1915 to 1923.

Mr. Speaker, April 24, 1915, represents a tragic day in the history of the Armenian people. It is a day that has left an indelible mark on the consciousness of mankind. Eighty-one years ago, the Ottoman Turks unleashed the forces of hatred upon Armenian men, women, and children in a deliberate policy of extermination. On this fateful night, the Ottoman Turks ruthlessly rounded up and targeted for elimination Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders.

For 8 bloody years a reign of terror-ruled the daily lives of Armenians in the Ottoman empire. For 8, long, horrific years, Armenians were consumed by the fires of racial and religious intolerance. Tragically, by the end of 1923, the entire Armenian population of Anatolia and western Armenian had been either killed or deported.

On the eve of launching the Jewish Holocaust, Adolph Hitler commented to his generals, "Who, after all, speaks of the annihilation of the Armenians?" Mr. Speaker, the Members of the U.S. Congress speak of the annihilation of the Armenians. We speak out

tonight so that future generations of Americans will know the facts surrounding the first genocide of the 20th century. We observe this solemn anniversary, along with the Armenian-American community and the people of Armenia, so that no one will be able to deny the undeniable.

Many of the survivors of the Armenian genocide established new lives in America, contributing their considerable talents and energy to the economic prosperity and cultural diversity of our great Nation. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of gratitude toward Americans of Armenian descent and a deep sense of moral obligation that I join my colleagues in honoring the memory of these fallen victims of genocide. They are not forgotten.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the Armenian genocide, as we do every year on April 24. This is a time of solemn remembrance, as Armenians everywhere set apart this day to mark the genocide perpetrated against them by the Ottoman empire in 1915 and afterwards. For friends of Armenians, this is an occasion to express condolences and to show solidarity with the worldwide Armenian community.

We not only mourn with them the loss of some 1.5 million Armenians but we voice our determination to prevent any such horrors from recurring. Unfortunately, the Armenian genocide was only the first in this bloody century of horrors. Since then, powerful states have singled out and massacred other ethnic, racial or religious minorities, and to judge by the atrocities committed in this decade in Yugoslavia, human cruelty knows no bounds of geography, race or religion.

Nevertheless, Armenians—the first victims of genocide this century—have served as models of strength, steadfastness and resistance. The most important target of resistance is amnesia. Armenians have taught us the lesson that some events are too important not to recall—no matter how painful—for the particular nation in question, and for all of us, but equally important is the lesson that a nation's hopes do not flicker out with the loss of so many of its children. Instead of being defeated, the wound can steel the soul and fertilize dreams of freedom and security.

Today, an independent Armenian state guarantees the security and future of the nation. Despite all the difficulties and travails of the last few years, Armenia has defended its people and will continue to do so. For our part, we today signal our commitment to foster all efforts to resolve the causes of tension between Armenia and its neighbors. The road to peace and normal relations among the states of Transcaucasia is arduous, but it must be pursued by all the peoples of the region with the decisiveness and strength that Armenians have demonstrated in keeping alive their traditions and striving for freedom.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, it brings me no pleasure to stand before you in remembrance of the tragedy that mars this day in history. But the silent denial of wrongdoing that continues to accompany this date 81 years after the fact underscores the importance of this special order. April 24 stands as a black mark on the historical calendar; for the victims of the Armenian genocide perpetrated by an unapologetic government, I must call attention to these horrible deeds.

It was on April 24, 1915, that the Ottoman empire commenced a genocidal cleansing unlike any that had come before. In seizing 200 Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders on this date, the Ottomans announced that Armenians would no longer be considered worthy of the basic human rights which must be afforded to all humanity. For the next 8 years they would brutally demonstrate the extent of these beliefs as they slaughtered 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children, and forced another half million from their homes.

On this solemn day, we must pay homage to the uncompensated families for whom this day brings nothing but sorrow. The genocide of the Armenian people has never been recognized by the Turkish Government; no apology or reparations have been made. Instead, 81 years later, the wholesale slaughter of human beings goes unrecognized and unpunished. This day stands in infamy as a precursor to the atrocities of Hitler, the unspeakable acts in Rwanda, and the recent attempts acts of ethnic cleansing in Bosnia-Herzegovina. In allowing these deeds to go unpunished we have said to the world that these heinous crimes are acceptable, that the rights of mankind are not universal. But human rights are not malleable ideas, subject to the whims of a nation and the inhumanity of its leaders, and the bonds which one person imposes on another can not be tolerated by a nation based on the concept of liberty and the rule of law. It is for these reasons that we must continue to honor this date, and in honoring it remember the evil of which we are capable.

In honor of the 1.5 million Armenians who lost their lives for no reason other than their heritage, we must ensure that the rights of humanity are protected regardless of the false boundaries of nationalism. We are all children of the same Creator; if we are not our brother's keeper, there will be no brother left in our hour of need. As we have said of the Holocaust, we say of this too, never again.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] for arranging this special order today. His support of the Armenian community has been, and continues to be tremendous.

Today we mark the 81st anniversary of the beginning of the Armenian genocide. On this date in 1915 hundreds of Armenian political and intellectual leaders were rounded up, exiled, and eventually murdered in remote places. In the ensuing 8 years, over 1.5 million men, women, and children were slaughtered in an attempted genocide of the Armenian people by the Government of the Ottoman Empire. This was a crime not just against the Armenian people. It was a crime against humanity. We must never forget this tragedy of unimaginable proportions.

I have friends who were present during that time. One friend of mine was turned over to a Turkish family by his own mother and father. He then had to endure watching the systematic murder of every single member of his family as well as the killing of many from his community. These kinds of unspeakable atrocities were commonplace in Armenia between 1915 and 1923.

A strong, resilient people, the Armenians survived these cruelties as they have survived

persecution for centuries. Their descendants now include over 1 million Americans for whom marking this day is not only a way to remember those who perished, but a way to remind mankind that we must all come together in pursuit of a common goal: to see to it that slaughter of this size and scope has no chance of ever happening again.

Unfortunately, brutality against Armenians continues to this day. The current conflict with Azerbaijan in the Nagorno-Karabagh region has once again brought suffering to the Armenian people. It is my sincere hope that the U.S. Government will do whatever it can to aid in the reaching of peace. Karabagh Armenians currently under the rule of the Azerbaijani Government must have their rights protected.

Today in America, Armenians flourish in the United States as prominent citizens and community leaders despite the pain they and their ancestors have endured. Many survivors of the genocide now live in my district. In fact, in my district, I have the greatest concentration of Armenians outside of Armenia. Armenians serve proudly and with great distinction as mayors, and members of local councils and school boards.

It is with great pride that I have had the chance to serve the Armenian citizenry of my district. On this, my last opportunity as a Member of Congress to observe this day, I wish to thank the Armenian community for its support.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, today is the day we have set aside to commemorate a painful time in world history—the 81st anniversary of the deaths of more than 1½ million Armenians. While the magnitude of the loss and the depth of the sorrow do not dim with time for the descendants of those who died, I join my colleagues in this observance today in the hope that a day of remembrance can bring a measure of healing.

This is what good and caring people do the world over when a tragedy occurs—grieve, console, reminisce. The first anniversary of the Oklahoma City bombing was recently the occasion of such a day of thought and remembrance. The shocking jolt that the bombing last year wreaked on the security that Americans have long enjoyed in this country will never be forgotten and will join the all-too-long list of events that, through their sheer awfulness, forever alter a country or a people. Indeed, we are even now watching with empathy the victims of the war in Bosnia, who, even as they struggle to get their footing as they emerge from their national nightmare, learn of atrocities such as mass graves and, as incredible as it may be that this could be happening again, watch as individuals—so-called leaders—are being turned over to the appropriate authorities for serious war crimes.

As much as this day of remembrance brings home the moral frailty and potential for cruelty, however, it is, more important, also proof that the majority of us firmly denounce the hateful actions of a few. For us, there is no political jargon, ancestral enmity, or religious fervor that could ever justify the deeds perpetrated in Armenia that we commemorate today, the slaughter that we revisited last week in Oklahoma, or any similar actions anyplace, anytime.

As a member of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, I affirm my strong sup-

port for a strong and vibrant relationship between Armenia and the United States. I will work to do my part to ensure that the legacy of future generations of Armenians is not marked by persecution, but rather by personal and national security, democracy, freedom, and prosperity.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Armenian community in my district to mark the 81st anniversary of an unspeakable tragedy. I am referring to the genocide of 1.5 million of their people by the Ottoman Empire.

On April 24, 1915, 200 Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders from Istanbul, taken to the interior of Turkey and summarily murdered. Thus began an 8-year campaign to eradicate or deport all Armenian citizens from Anatolia and western Armenia.

Yet, today, many people are unaware of this vicious crime against humanity. There is little mention of it in our history books. It is not taught to our children in school. And now, the Turkish Government is funding Chairs of Turkish history at prestigious American universities in order to cleanse its image and deny its past. For example, the Republic of Turkey endowed Princeton University with \$1.5 million for its Ataturk Chair of Turkish Studies. The professor who holds this chair is the former executive director of a Turkish institute that works to discredit scholarship which mentions the Armenian genocide.

However, my colleagues and I are here today to let the Armenian people know that we will not forget. We will not forget the aggression of the Ottoman Empire against innocent lives, particularly those of women and children. We will not forget that when the genocide ended, half of the world's Armenian population had been decimated. We will not forget that by 1923, the Turks had successfully erased nearly all remnants of the Armenian culture which had existed in their homeland for 3,000 years.

I stand here today to say that the genocide did happen. Nobody can erase the painful memories of the Armenian community. Nobody can deny the photos and historical references. Nobody can deny that few Armenians live where millions lived over 80 years ago. It is our responsibility and our duty to keep the memories of this tragedy alive. A world that forgets these tragedies is a world that will see them repeated again and again.

We cannot right the terrible injustice inflicted upon the Armenian community and we can never heal the wounds. But by properly commemorating this tragedy, Armenians will be least know the world has not forgotten the misery of those years. Only then will Armenians begin to receive the justice they deserve.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues today in remembering the tragedy endured by the Armenian people in the years 1915–23.

Extensive massacres of Armenians took place during that period in eastern Anatolian plains in an atmosphere akin to a horrible civil war. Those events have indelibly and permanently marked the consciousness of many Americans, including Americans of Armenian descent, who are commemorating April 24, 1996, as a national day of remembrance of

man's inhumanity to man and a special day of remembrance for the Armenian victims of strife in the early years of this century.

April 24 marks the 81st anniversary of the calamity. It is appropriate on this occasion to direct our attention and prayers to the memory of the vast number of victims who died in these tragic events.

It is in the interest of all of us and in the interest of mankind that this type of tragedy not occur again. The leading organizations of the Armenian-American community have been seeking to work within our political system for a statement concerning these critical events in their heritage.

This year in the House of Representatives that vehicle is House Concurrent Resolution 47, honoring the memory of the victims of the massacres of Armenians, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor. No one can deny these events and the centrality of these events in modern Armenian history. I am proud to be associated today with my colleagues on this important day of remembrance.

I would also like to salute the Republic of Armenia, which continues to move forward in its democratic and economic reforms. This country of 3.3 million people is already developing important ties with the United States. Americans have an interest in the economic development of Armenia, its progress toward a free market economy, and its development of democratic institutions. We want to work with Armenia and its neighbors to insure peace, stability, and progress in their search for greater freedom and security. There is no better way to honor the misdeeds of the past than rededicating ourselves to a better future.

Today in Europe, we have a chance to advance the cause of peace and stability more vigorously and on a wider scale than ever before. I salute all governments, private organizations, and individuals, including the Armenians, who are working toward this end. I hope that their efforts will make the world a safer place, where innocent people no longer suffer the unspeakable crimes of war and terror.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the Armenian victims of the genocide brought upon them by the Ottoman Turks and to commend my colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman JOHN EDWARD PORTER and the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman FRANK PALLONE, for organizing special orders today so that Members of the House may take the time to remember the one-and-a-half million Armenians who were brutally slaughtered by the Ottoman Empire.

Eighty-one years ago on April 24, 1915, the Ottoman Empire's horrible operation against the Armenian community was inaugurated. During the eight grisly years that followed that infamous date, the Armenian people would be subjected to a sick, ghastly campaign of systematic genocide and deportation. During the years of 1915 to 1923, over 1.5 million Armenians were murdered by the genocidal Ottoman Turks while another 500,000 were subjected to forced exile from their homeland.

Mr. Speaker, the eight years of the Armenian genocide will always be considered one of the grimmest in the history of mankind. So that we never forget this travesty to the con-

cept of human rights, we must always observe the date of April 24. To not do so would be equivalent to neglecting the remembrance of those Armenians who had perished, who were harmed or who were uprooted during the tyranny of the Ottoman Turks. Mr. Speaker, we must not and can not let that happen.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in honor of the Armenian people whose human rights were trodden upon, I encourage all of my colleagues to take the time and remember the plight and situation of the Armenian people and remember that we must always fight hatred and bigotry wherever it can be found.

THE 81ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, we mark the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide, which did not occur in 1 year, 1915, but lasted over an 8-year period from 1915 to 1923, during which time the Turks of the Ottoman Empire carried out a systematic policy of eliminating its Christian Armenian minority. This was the first example of genocide in the 20th century, a precursor to the Nazi Holocaust and other cases of ethnic cleansing and mass extermination in our own time; and we must never forget it, for forgetting history not only dishonors the victims and survivors, it encourages other tyrants to believe that they can kill with impunity.

Mr. Speaker, today's occasion is, of course, a time for solemn reflection, but it is also an occasion that affords us the opportunity to celebrate the human capacity of resilience, the ability even of people faced with the most horrendous disasters and challenges to rebuild their shattered lives. We can see this determination to overcome such an atrocious past in those of Armenian descent.

On a national level, the struggle for survival and the sense of a hope for a better future can be seen by the very existence of the young, independent, democratic Republic of Armenia.

Despite the preponderance of evidence about the historic fact of the genocide against the Armenian people, which is strong and undeniable, modern Turkey continues to deny that the Armenian genocide took place. While various Turkish sources expressed the view that certain unfortunate incidents took place, it denies there was ever any systematic ethnically based policy targeted against the Armenian people. There are those who say we should not offend our Turkish allies by using the word genocide, but let us call it what it was. It was genocide, a most horrible genocide where over 1.5 million people, including women and children, lost their lives and over 500,000 Armenians were killed, eradicating the

Armenian historic homeland from Turkey.

Let us remind ourselves that our country and the rest of the world at that time turned away and did nothing to prevent these horrible human rights violations against innocent men, women, and children.

□ 1715

The problems we face from Turkey historically with Armenia have not gone away, and they are continuing now in a different form against another minority people. Let us remind ourselves as well that today in Turkey another genocide is occurring by the Turkish Government against yet another Turkish minority, the Kurdish people.

Today, thousands of Turkish troops have not only driven through the southeastern portion of Turkey, executing those in the Kurdish minority who oppose them burning and tearing down Kurdish towns, but also crossed into the border in Iraq to attack Kurdish people in their refugee camps. And let us remind ourselves, Mr. Speaker, that our Government has not acted to prevent this additional genocide, but has actually supported this action against an innocent people.

We remind ourselves today of our responsibilities to other human beings, and in commemorating the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide, each one of us should say to ourselves we are our brother's keeper, and that we do have a responsibility to others to stand up and tell the world that a genocide occurred in 1915 to 1923, and that another is occurring today.

This past year in hammering out the fiscal 1996 foreign funding bill, the Foreign Operations Subcommittee sent a strong message to Turkey that we will not sit idly by as they commit egregious human rights violations not only against their own but also against their smaller struggling neighbors, including Armenia. We cut their economic assistance in the last year, Mr. Speaker.

We passed the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, which ensures that any country that henceforth prevents transit of U.S. humanitarian aid intended for other people will forfeit all U.S. economic military and military assistance, and we provided to the Armenian people support of \$85 million of aid for food, fuel and medical supplies and an additional \$30 million for economic and technical assistance.

We have made great progress in the last years in helping to establish a new Armenia, an Armenia that is free and democratic and forging ahead to provide through economic freedom a greater economic life to its people and a greater stability for its future.

Mr. Speaker, we have made that commitment previously. We have to renew it this year. Even in tough budgetary

times, we ought to realize that, if we can prevent the kind of foreign assistance, provide the kind of foreign assistance to Armenia, a struggling young country that does reflect the values that this country stands for and believes in, we will do a great deal to extend those values across the world.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DINGELL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE 81ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in marking one of the most appalling violations of human rights in all of human history—as today marks the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

I want to commend my colleagues JOHN PORTER of Illinois and FRANK PALLONE of New Jersey, the cochairs of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, for sponsoring this special order.

The great Armenian massacre which took place between 1915 to 1916, shocked public opinion in the United States and Western Europe. As Henry Morgenthau, Sr., the former U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, stated:

I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915.

Mr. Speaker, in reality, this atrocity lasted over an 8-year period from 1915 to 1923. During this time, the Ottoman Empire carried out a systematic policy of eliminating its Christian Armenian population.

As a Greek-American, I have always felt a special kinship for the Armenian people. My Greek ancestors like those of Armenian descent, have also suffered at the hands of the Ottoman Empire,

and as my colleagues may know, I hold a special order every year to celebrate Greek independence from over 400 years of Turkish oppression.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have co-sponsored House Concurrent Resolution 47, which honors the memory of the victims of the Armenian genocide.

I have also joined my colleagues in sending a letter to President Clinton expressing disappointment in the fact that he used the word "massacres" rather than the word "genocide" to describe this systematic annihilation of 1.5 million Armenians. In my opinion this distinction is more than a matter of semantics; it is rather the difference between a random series of atrocities and a systematic, ethnically based policy of extermination.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask that we take a moment to reflect upon the hardships endured by the Armenians. In the face of adversity the Armenian people have persevered. The survivors of the genocide and their descendants have made great contributions to every country in which they have settled—including the United States, where Armenians have made their mark in business, the professions, and our cultural life. Commemorate seems the wrong word to use, Mr. Speaker, but it is fitting and right that we mark this dark event today. For it is only through focusing on it that we hold out hope for the future that no such event will occur again.

COMMEMORATING THE EIGHTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to commend my colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey, FRANK PALLONE, and the gentleman from Illinois, JOHN PORTER, for taking out this commemorative of the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

Mr. Speaker, beginning on the night of April 24 in 1915, the religious and intellectual leaders of the Armenian community of Constantinople were taken from their beds, imprisoned, tortured, and killed.

In the days that followed, the remaining males over 15 years of age were gathered in cities, towns, and villages throughout Ottoman Turkey, roped together, marched to nearby uninhabited areas, and killed.

Innocent women and children were forced to march through barren wastelands—urged on by whips and clubs—denied food and water.

And when they dared to step out of line, they were repeatedly attacked, robbed, raped, and ultimately killed.

When all was said and done, 1½ million Armenians lay dead, and a home-

land which had stood for 3,000 years was nearly completely depopulated.

Mr. Speaker, we come to the floor this evening to remember the victims—and the survivors—of the Armenian genocide.

As we come to this floor, we do so with the knowledge that all of us have a responsibility to remember the victims, to speak out and to make sure that tragedies like this are never allowed to happen again.

That's one of the reasons why some of us have introduced a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 47, sponsored by over 150 of our colleagues to remember the victims of the Armenian genocide.

Now more than ever, those of us who embrace democracy have a responsibility to speak out for all those who live under tyranny.

Because sadly, the world does not seem to have learned the lessons of the past.

We have seen bloodshed this decade in places like Bosnia and Nagorno Karabakh.

American leadership has helped to bring about a chance for peace in Bosnia.

Now we must do the same in Nagorno Karabakh.

For most Americans, Nagorno Karabakh is not a place that registers on the radar screen, for it is not a CNN war.

But it is a place where 100,000 people have been killed or wounded over the past 7 years, and 1 million others have been left homeless.

Mr. Speaker, we're all hopeful that this terrible tragedy ends soon. We're all hopeful that the cease-fire in place for 2 years continues to hold while work continues to bring about a lasting peace.

People are slowly starting to return to their homes.

In recent months, our administration, the Russian government, the OSCE Minsk Group, Turkey, Azerbaijan, and Armenia have all begun efforts to resolve the conflict.

But our efforts must be intensified, and the integrity and security of the Armenians in Nagorno Karabakh must be guaranteed as we move forward.

We must also continue to speak out against the refusal of Turkey to allow humanitarian aid to flow into Armenia.

Mr. Speaker, we now have a provision in law, section 562, that cuts off aid to any country, that restricts the transport or delivery of U.S. humanitarian assistance.

It is utterly unconscionable to me that a country who is an ally of ours, who is a member of NATO, and who accepts U.S. aid, would think it has the right to block U.S. humanitarian assistance.

The third largest recipient of U.S. assistance must know that section 562

will be enforced and the aid will stop unless it ends its blockade of Armenia.

Mr. Speaker, we must pause today and say "Never again."

We can forget that in 1939, another leader used the Armenian genocide as justification for his own genocide.

This leader said, and I quote:

I have given orders to my death units to exterminate without mercy or pity, men, women, and children belonging to the Polish-speaking race. After all,

Adolf Hitler asked,

who today remembers the extermination of the Armenians?

Mr. Speaker, it is up to all of us to remember.

For centuries, the Armenian people have shown great courage and great strength.

The least we can do is match their courage with our commitment.

Because in the end, we are their voices and we must do all we can to remember.

Because if we don't, nobody else will.

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, between 1915 and 1923 the Ottoman Turkish Empire committed a terrible genocide against Armenians. In a systematic and deliberate campaign to eliminate the Armenian people and erase their culture and history of 3,000 years the Turks committed this atrocity. As a result, over one-half million Armenians were massacred. The Armenian genocide is a historical fact, and has been recognized by academics and historians all over the world. The documentary evidence is irrefutable and beyond question. Unfortunately, the Turkish Government is still persisting in their denial that the genocide took place.

Many survivors of the genocide have made the United States their new home. On April 24, 1996, Armenians all over the world will commemorate the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Commemoration activities will occur in Washington, DC, Los Angeles, and in my district in Fresno, CA. I have the honor of representing thousands of Armenians in California's Nineteenth Congressional District, and I send my sincerest condolences on this solemn occasion to all members of the Armenian community. As a member of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, I intend to join my colleagues, Representatives PORTER and FRANK PALLONE, in a special order on April 24, 1996 on the floor of the House of Representatives to commemorate the genocide victims.

I am an original cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 47 which calls on Congress to officially recognize the

Armenian genocide and encourages the Republic of Turkey to do the same. This legislation would call on the Government of Turkey to turn away from its denials of the Armenian genocide, and instead, to openly acknowledge this tragic chapter in its history. By doing so, the Turkish Government can help to raise the level of trust in a strategic, yet highly unstable, region of the world and facilitate the normalization of relations between Turkey and Armenia. I encourage my colleagues to vote for the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 47.

Remembering this genocide against the Armenians will help ensure that this type of tragedy is never allowed to occur again.

□ 1730

BRAD PELZER BONE MARROW DONOR DRIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MASCARA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MASCARA. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to plead the case of 11-year-old Brad Pelzer from my district who needs a bone marrow transplant. Brad is suffering from CML, an adult form of leukemia.

Until early this year, Brad Pelzer was a typical 5th grader at Charleroi Elementary Center, located in my hometown of Charleroi, PA. Brad, an honor student, enjoys playing soccer, deck hockey, and using his family's computer.

But in February Brad became ill and by the end of the month he was diagnosed with leukemia. Now Brad and his parents, Joe and Josie Pelzer, are engaged in a desperate search for someone whose bone marrow will match Brad's.

Brad's doctors say a transplant from such a donor will offer him his best hope for beating this very serious illness.

Like hundreds of other parents faced with a similar situation, Joe and Josie are mustering every ounce of courage and hope they can. After discovering no family members were a match for Brad, they sought the help of local blood bank officials. They have organized three donor drives over the next several weeks to seek a potential donor from the local community.

As the chart reflects, the first will be held tomorrow, April 25, from 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. at California University in California, PA. Donors should go to the performance center located in the student union.

The second will be held Saturday, April 27, from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m. in the north Charleroi fire hall. The third will be held Monday, May 6, from 9 a.m. to 1:45 p.m. in the first floor conference

room of the Washington County Courthouse in Washington, PA.

Anyone who is 18 to 60 years old is invited to come and give blood and be tested. The reward would be so great—giving life to Brad.

It is very ironic to me that Brad's situation came to my attention at this time when the Nation is observing National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week.

His family are long-time friends of mine, his grandparents, Leroy and Susan Rotolo and Rita Pelzer, are my neighbors. They are very lovely people. Good, solid citizens. And now they must rely upon the goodness of the rest of us to help them through this very trying and difficult ordeal.

Situations like this make you reflect on the blessings that have been bestowed upon us and how important it is to reach out and be kind and helpful to our neighbors and friends.

Having children and grandchildren of my own, I know exactly how Joe and Josie feel. They are looking for an answer and the miracle might be a person who is viewing these special orders tonight. You could be the one to reach out to Brad Pelzer and help save his life.

According to material marking National Donor Awareness Week, provided by Congressman MOAKLEY, a transplant recipient himself, at any given time 43,000 Americans are awaiting a transplant. They are rich and poor. They are old and young. And they all need our help.

The amazing thing is even if you live nowhere near Charleroi, PA, you can still help Brad Pelzer, and the thousands of other youngsters in need of a bone marrow transplant. The American Red Cross has set up a 1-800 number you can call to locate the nearest blood bank where you can be tested and added to the national bone marrow transplant registry.

Since the bone marrow transplant registry was established in the mid-1980's, over 1.6 million people have been added to the registry. Because the base of donors is growing each year, I am told that 60 percent of patients find a matched donor on their first search.

The bottom line is please attend one of the drives in my district, or call 1-800-MARROW-2, and help improve the chances for Brad.

His mom and dad, his brother, Brent, and his grandparents, are all praying that you will answer the call. Please help. Hang in there Brad—we'll find a match.

LYON COUNTY WANTS EPA TO HALT SUPERFUND CLEANUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House this evening to talk

about the environment. Last evening, I spoke to my colleagues about education, and this has been Earth Day this week, and Earth Week. People talk about saving the environment. And last night I talked about paying more for education and getting less. Tonight I wanted to address the House and my colleagues about paying more for preserving and protecting the environment and getting less.

Just a few hours ago the House passed, I believe, the 13th or 14th continuing resolution, and that is a temporary resolution to fund the Government for one more day, and you know we have had a tremendous amount of difficulty in trying to nail down the budget and nail down the expenditures for this year that we are in, 6 months into.

What we have not been able to do on our side of the aisle is really tell the American people or convince a majority of our colleagues here that we, in fact, are paying more in education. Tonight I use as an example the environment and getting less for cleanup. And part of the contest that the Congress is engaged in is not just a question of how much more money you spend on these programs, but how you spend it: Are we protecting the environment?

One of the things that I have learned as chairman of the House Civil Service Committee is where the bodies are buried or where the public servants are working in the large bureaucracy we have, with so many people employed by the Federal Government. Particularly, my concern is Washington, DC, and then some of the regional offices, if you just take a minute and look at what part of this debate is about with EPA.

The total number of EPA employees has grown to almost 18,000 EPA employees. There are 6,000 EPA employees in Washington, DC. Now, that 6,000 is equal to about the total number of employees in EPA about a little over a decade ago. If this were the only figure, this 17,000, it would be huge by any measure. But, in fact, you find thousands and thousands of contract employees. If you wonder where the rest of these employees are, there are 6,000 in Washington, there is another approximately 1,200, a 1,000 to 1,300 in 10 regional offices across the country.

When I get down to my State of Florida, we had a total, I believe, of 65 EPA employees in this particular fiscal year.

So people who think that EPA is out there in the States protecting the environment, it is not so. They are in Washington, and they are passing countless rules and regulations. A tremendous amount is spent on administration.

And then some of the programs we have heard talked about like Superfund. Superfund, I have explained to the House, over 80 percent of the funds on Superfund have been spent on attorney fees and studies.

I had a gentleman visit me in my office yesterday, and he said a Superfund site in Florida was identified in 1984. He said it went through a half a dozen project administrators and they still have not done anything to resolve the problems of the Superfund site. That is in Florida.

Here is a site in Nevada. Lyon County commissioners, and this is part of a release from them, asked the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to halt mercury cleanup program of the Carson River. The mercury that they were going to clean up is left over from mining operations of the Comstock Lode in the 1800's.

Then we have another example, of Vermont here, Burlington, Vermont. Twelve years ago, after a site was picked there to clean up some hazardous waste left over from a coal gasification plant, nothing was done. They spent millions of dollars. Very little was done in the way of environmental cleanup.

So we are paying more, we are getting less, and the more I talk about this, the more examples that are brought for me from across the country, and that is part of the debate. Republicans favor protecting the environment, preserving the environment. Republicans favor clean water, clean air, clean land. But when you spend money like this, when the money goes for a bureaucracy like this, and it does not go for a cleanup, then we have a real problem.

I want to quote as I get towards the end here a comment from Carol Browner, EPA administrator, who said in the New York Times in 1993, in November: "When I worked at the state level, I was constantly faced with rigid rules that made doing something 110 times more difficult and expensive than it needed to be. It makes no sense to have a program that raises costs while doing nothing to reduce environmental threats."

Now, that is Carol Browner, former Florida EPA administrator, commenting on her experience in dealing with the Federal Government.

So, Mr. Speaker, I call on Carol Browner, I call on this administration, I call on my colleagues, to stop paying more and getting less. We can do a better job if we concentrate and effectively utilize our limited taxpayer dollars.

A SPECIAL DAY, A SPECIAL EVENT, AND VERY SPECIAL STUDENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I participated in an Earth Day celebration back home in my district. The event was a Hometown Trees celebration and took

place at the Kika de la Garza Elementary school whose principal is Mr. Jose Luis Trigo.

We planted a live oak tree in remembrance of the children of the Oklahoma bombing tragedy. This was donated by first grader Amy Sojak and her classmates. Amy and her classmates are students of Miss Veronica Galvan. Fourth grade student Joel Espinoza was the master of ceremonies. And awards were presented to the following students for their essays which emphasized the special and unique benefits provided by trees: Victor Villarreal, Brandi Martinez, Andres Aguilar, Juan Carlos Lopez, and Denise Sepulveda.

What was particularly exciting about the occasion is that 10 year old Victor Villarreal was recognized as the Hometown Trees National Essay Contest Winner for the Southwest region. He is the son of Guadalupe and Francisca Villarreal.

Over the past 5 years, Hometown Trees, sponsored by IGA supermarkets, Louisiana-Pacific and Coca-Cola, has teamed up with thousands of local volunteers in communities nationwide to ensure that the future generations will enjoy the ecological and aesthetic benefits of trees. This year, as part of the Hometown Trees initiative, IGA sponsored a nationwide environmental essay contest for children age 12 and under.

Young Victor won the contest—quite an accomplishment and one of which he can be very proud. His essay was chosen for its uniqueness and creativity. It vividly captures the importance of trees from a child's perspective.

It reads: "Trees are important in my hometown because at La Joya, 'The Jewel of the Valley,' we treasure trees—our jewels. They add that special spark that only nature can provide. Anything that mother nature creates, is a true treasure that no other power can originate. Treasure your jewels!"

To specifically honor Victor's accomplishment a tree donated by IGA and Carl's Grocery was planted. It will forever be a living monument to him. These trees will be enjoyed by all the community.

What made this occasion particularly unique for me is that I feel the sentiments expressed by Victory are shared by his fellow students. What I saw in the faces of the youngsters was an eagerness not just to participate in an event for the one day we officially recognize as Earth Day, but rather a desire to make every day Earth Day.

This tells me that as we celebrate this 26th Anniversary we have passed on to our children and grandchildren how important it is to look after our environment in the way we live our lives every day. That is quite an accomplishment—and Victor, and all of his fellow students, are quite an outstanding group of youngsters.

THE 81ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I join all of my colleagues today in commemoration of April 24, 1996, the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide which

occurred under such tragic circumstances 81 years ago, and it is my purpose to join with my colleagues to insist that such inhumanity never be repeated again.

Mr. Speaker, today we are recalling the loss of 1½ million Armenians who were killed and a half million more who were driven from Turkey. No person of any decency can do other than oppose this sort of inhumanity, and all join in a statement of hope for a world free of genocide and ethnic conflict.

I have the great privilege to represent a large and active Armenian population, many of whom have parents and grandparents who were amongst the persecuted religious, political, and intellectual leaders in the turn of the century Armenia.

Today's Michigan community of Armenians follow the great tradition of doing much to further the commercial, political, and intellectual growth of Michigan and of the country. It is my hope that today's effort to honor the victims and the survivors of this genocide will educate all of us, will educate our neighbors country men and all of the world's people so that peace remains a priority of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this is the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide. We look back to honor those who have died, but we also look forward and say, "Never again."

□ 1745

BUDGET SHORTFALL FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago I announced, along with the chairman of the Committee on National Security, that we were going to address a shortfall in funding under the Clinton administration budget that seriously impeded the capability of our pilots to operate their aircraft effectively and safely. That was done on the heels of the hearing in which we talked about the three, now four, F-14 crashes since the first of January and the three AV-8B Harrier Marine Corps jet aircraft crashes since the first of January.

We talked about the fact that the Clinton administration is not going to spend the money to make the safety upgrades to 24 of the Marine aircraft that are going to be piloted by young Americans. The chairman of the full committee, my friend FLOYD SPENCE and I made the decision that we would commit to spend the money that was necessary to upgrade those aircraft so that they are 50 percent safer than they would otherwise be, and we also made the commitment to make the \$83 million in safety upgrades to the F-14 aircraft.

It was an indication to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Clinton administration's defense budget, which has been slashed in excess of \$150 billion below the budget put together by Dick Cheney and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Colin Powell, it was another indication to me that this budget is coming apart at the seams.

Today I have the duty of reporting to my colleagues and to the American people that there is another indicator that the Clinton defense budget is coming apart at the seams. That indicator is that we now have examined the ammunition supplies that the U.S. Marine Corps will depend on in the two major regional conflict scenarios. That means if they should get involved in a conflict in the Middle East and at the same time be involved in a conflict on the Korean peninsula, would they have the ammunition to carry out both of those operations, which is a requirement that the President of the United States has told the American people the Marines will be able to meet.

The answer, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately is no. The Marines do not have the basic ammunition load necessary to carry out two major regional contingencies. Their ammo pouches in those contingencies will at some point be empty, and they will be empty because the Clinton administration is not willing to spend the money to put that ammo in their ammo pouches.

I have received now from the Marines a list of ammo that they need to be able to fight those contingencies for the American people, and that ammo list comes to \$369 million. I have talked this over with the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, FLOYD SPENCE, and we have agreed that we are going to commit today to fund that full ammunition load for the U.S. Marine Corps.

It makes no sense, and it certainly is greatly lacking in compassion and consideration for our military people to suit them up and move them around the world to project American power and protect American interests and freedom, and not give them the doggone ammunition that they need to get the job done.

So once again the Clinton defense budget has come up this time \$369 million short in the area of ammunition. We were first apprised of this when we saw the GAO report, the initial informal report that said that the Marines did not have the ammo to fight two wars. We examined it. We talked to people. We finally got the list of exactly what they need to have full ammunition pouches.

So the Republicans are riding to the rescue of America's fighting people. We are going to see to it that they have the right equipment and the right ammunition to get the job done, and we are committing today to spend the money that is necessary to do that.

THE 81ST ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide, an act of mass murder that took 1.5 million Armenian lives and led to the exile of the Armenian nation from its historic homeland.

It is of vital importance that we never forget what happened to the Armenian people. Indeed the only thing we can do for the victims is to remember, and we forget at our own peril.

The Armenian genocide, which began 15 years after the start of the 20th century, was the first act of genocide of this century, but it was far from the last. The Armenian genocide was followed by the Holocaust, Stalin's purges, and other acts of mass murder around the world.

Adolf Hitler himself said that the world's indifference to the slaughter in Armenia indicated that there would be no global outcry if he undertook the mass murder of Jews and others he considered less than human. And he was right. It was only after the holocaust that the cry "never again" arose throughout the world. But it was too late for millions of victims. Too late for the 6 million Jews. Too late for the 1.5 million Armenians.

Today we recall the Armenian genocide and we mourn its victims. We also pledge that we shall do everything we can to protect the Armenian nation against further aggression; in the Republic of Armenia, in Nagorno-Karabagh, or anywhere else.

Unfortunately, there are some who still think it is acceptable to block the delivery of U.S. humanitarian assistance around the world. Despite our success last year in including the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act in the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill signed by the President, Azerbaijan has continued its blockade of United States humanitarian assistance to Armenia.

It is tragic that Azerbaijan's tactics have denied food and medicine to innocent men, women, and children in Armenia, and created thousands of refugees. The United States must stand firm against any dealings with Azerbaijan until it ends this immoral blockade. We must make clear that warfare and blockades aimed at civilians are unacceptable as means for resolving disputes.

Mr. Speaker, after the genocide, the Armenian people wiped away their tears and cried out, "Let us never forget. Let us always remember the atrocities that have taken the lives of our parents and our children and our neighbors." I rise today to remember those cries and to make sure that they were not uttered in vain. The Armenian nation lives. We must do everything we

can to ensure that it is never imperiled again.

REMEMBER THE MARTYRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], and many others to remember the Armenian genocide.

Last week Members of Congress, the Nation and the world observed Yom HaShoah to honor and remember the millions of Jews who perished in the Holocaust. Sadly, one tragic truth about the Holocaust is that it occurred 20 years after the Armenian genocide, which took the lives of over 1½ million Armenians. In fact, it was Hitler who uttered the infamous statement, "Who remembers the Armenians?"

Today we stand here in this Chamber and in places around our Nation to do just that, to remember the Armenians, remember the martyrs, to say we will always remember them and we will never let the world forget the Armenian genocide that occurred at the hands of the Ottoman Turks.

It was just over 81 years ago that 1.5 million Armenians were systematically murdered and another 500,000 were driven from their homeland during the 8-year genocide. Revisionist historians have sadly doubted the historical reality of the genocide. The Armenians were not killed indiscriminately or at random. The Armenians murdered between 1915 and 1923 were the victims of a calculated extermination through starvation, torture and deportation, a genocide in every cruel meaning of the word and nothing less.

Earlier today back in my district, Mayor Peter Torigian of Peabody, MA held a remembrance and flag-raising ceremony that included 8 survivors of the genocide. These people are living proof that the genocide occurred. Their words bear witness to the reality of what happened 81 years ago.

Mayor Torigian often tells a terrifying but very sobering story of his mother, who survived the genocide. Any time someone tries to deny the historical reality of the genocide, he reminds them that his mother, who was quite ill and confined to a nursing home, often repeats an Armenian phrase which when translated means: "The soldiers are coming, the soldiers are coming." These are the words of a then terrified 14-year-old girl who was able to survive the atrocities inflicted upon her people many years ago.

I join with my colleagues in calling on President Clinton to use the word "genocide" as the only accurate description of the terror inflicted on the

Armenian people. For the dead and the living, we must bear witness so that this horror will never happen again.

COMMEMORATING THE 81ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my colleagues, Mr. PALLONE and Mr. PORTER, for once again organizing this special congressional opportunity for Congress to pause to honor the memory of the 1½ million Armenians who were killed between 1915 and 1923 by agents of the Turkish Ottoman Empire in what is known in infamy as the Armenian Genocide.

While we cautiously welcome the important gestures recently made by Turkey, in recognizing the independence of Armenia and the opening of an air corridor to Armenia, the history of the relationships between these two countries must be kept in perspective.

Some would claim that our remembrance today fans the flames of atavistic hatred and that the issue of the Ottoman government's efforts to destroy the Armenian people is a matter best left to scholars and historians. I do not agree. For whatever ambiguities may be invoked in the historic record of these events, one fact remains undeniable: the death and suffering of Armenians on a massive scale happened, and is deserving of recognition and remembrance.

This solemn occasion permits us to join in remembrance with the many Americans of Armenian ancestry, to remind this country of the tragic price paid by the Armenian community for its long pursuit of life, liberty and freedom.

Today, I rise, with my Colleagues, to recall and remember one of the most tragic events in history and through this act of remembrance, to make public and vivid the memory of the ultimate price paid by the Armenian community by this blot against human civility.

We come together each year with this act of commemoration, this year being the 81st anniversary of this genocide, to tell the stories of this atrocity so that we will not sink into ignorance of our capacity to taint human progress with acts of mass murder.

The Armenian genocide was a deliberate act to kill, or deport, all Armenians from Asia Minor, and takes its place in history with other acts of genocide such as Stalin's destruction of the Kulaks, Hitler's calculated wrath on the Jews, Poles, and Romany Gypsy community in Central Europe, and Pol Pot's attempt to purge incorrect political thought from Cambodia by killing all of his people over the age of fifteen,

and more recently, the ethnic cleansing atrocities in Bosnia.

We do not have the ability to go back and correct acts of a previous time, or to right the wrongs of the past. If we had this capacity, perhaps we could have prevented the murders of millions of men, women and children.

We can, however, do everything in our power to prevent such atrocities from occurring again. To do this, we must educate people about these horrible incidents, comfort the survivors and keep alive the memories of those who died.

I encourage everyone to use this moment to think about the tragedy which was the Armenian Genocide, to contemplate the massive loss of lives, and to ponder the loss of the human contributions which might have been.

Although, the massacre we depict and describe started 81 years ago, the Armenian people continue to fight for their freedom and independence today, in the Nagorno Karabagh.

Again, this year, I would like to close my remarks with an urgent plea that we use this moment as an occasion to recommit ourselves to the spirit of human understanding, compassion, patience, and love.

For these alone are the tools for overcoming our tragic, and uniquely human proclivity for resolving differences and conflicts by acts of violence.

This century has been characterized as one of the bloodiest in our archives of human history. Certainly, the genocide perpetuated against the Armenian peoples has been a factor in this dismal record.

The dawning of a new century offers our human race two paths. One continues along a road of destruction, distrust, and despair. Those who travel this path have lost their connection to the primal directives, which permit us as a society to maintain balance, continuity, and harmony.

I would ask my colleagues, on this 81st anniversary of one of history's bloodiest massacres of human beings—and during a time in history when violent solutions to problems between peoples continue to hold sway—to contemplate the second path. The map to this path exists within the guiding teachings of all major world religions and are encapsulated in what Christians refer to as the 10 Commandments. I would ask my colleagues, no matter their religious or political persuasions and beliefs, to revisit these core teachings which form a common bond between all peoples. To use these common beliefs as the basis for action and understanding in these trying times. The surface differences between peoples, offer only an exciting diversity in form. At the core all peoples are united by common dreams, aspirations, and beliefs in a desire for harmony, decency, and peace with justice.

Let these testimonies of the atrocities perpetuated against the Armenian people serve as a reminder that as a human race we can, and must, do better. It takes strength and wisdom to understand that the sword of compassion is indeed mightier than the sword of steel.

Certainly, as we reflect over the conflicts of this century, we can only come to the conclusion that violence begets violence, hatred begets hatred and that only understanding patience, compassion, and love can open the door to the realization of the dreams which we all hold for our children and for their children.

Let our statements today, remembering and openly condemning the atrocity committed against the Armenians, help renew a commitment of the American people to oppose any and all instances of genocide.

□ 1800

ECONOMIC REPERCUSSIONS OF INCREASING MINIMUM WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some comments on how we should increase wages of workers in this country and how we should not increase those wages.

The debate over the minimum wage is a debate really about the fundamental principles of government and how our society is to be organized. Unfortunately, the debate has been framed in terms of politics rather than policy. In light of this, I would like to make three points:

First, historically it has been well noted by many economists, Frederick Bastiat pointed out in 1853 that a just government would not interfere in a person's right to contract with someone else for his or her labor services.

Now, what this minimum wage legislation will do is tell, for example, a senior that wants to work part-time at maybe a day-care center, and 48.5 percent of those receiving minimum wages are voluntary part-time workers, that she or he cannot work if the day-care center cannot afford to pay \$5.15 per hour.

It says to the black teenager that he cannot try to get a first job and learn a skill if that employer cannot pay \$5.15 per hour, and if his services are not worth that at the beginning of his employment, prior to training, then he will not have that opportunity.

Those who would support the minimum wage must hold the position that government can tell you at what rate you can sell your labor. So here is a Federal law saying you cannot work, you cannot sell your labor, for less than what the Federal Government mandates is a fair wage.

This is not consistent with a just society or the freedom of individuals.

Second, an increase in the minimum wage is really going to harm the poor. Increasing the minimum wage must result in some workers being laid off. So the question is, are we going to pass a law that helps some, because some will benefit from an increase in minimum wage, while at the same time telling a few of those who are no longer going to be employed that they cannot be employed because the employer will not pay them the higher minimum wage that is contemplated to be established?

It is just a matter of how many jobs will be lost. Assuming no job losses is equivalent to assuming a perfectly inelastic demand for unskilled labor, which clearly is not the case.

This is just a quick effort to represent the supply and demand for the market for unskilled, entry level jobs. If you have the demand curve going down; in other words, the higher the wages, the less number are going to be employed, and so as the demand curves down to a lower wage and a greater number being employed, and likewise the supply is going to increase so the higher the wages the more people that are going to be looking for those jobs, you end up at the intersection with what is the equilibrium wage. If we raise the minimum wage higher, that means this change will represent that number of people that are going to no longer be employed.

It just makes sense that there are some people in our society at the beginning that will no longer be able to be employed if we raise the minimum wage up to \$5.15 an hour. But increasing the minimum wage will not make any dent in the poverty rate. Of the 23.5 million adults in poverty, just over 2 percent are working for the minimum wage. Increasing the minimum wage will cost the unskilled their job opportunities.

Professors Neumark and Wascher, in their paper in Industrial and Labor Relations Review, estimate a 90-cent increase in the minimum wage will destroy more than one-half million unskilled jobs.

Now, an increase in the minimum wage of 90 cents will raise prices by an estimated 2.2 billion, and those price increases will mostly affect poor people. This price rise will come about because some small businesses in competitive industries will go out of business or produce less. This decrease in supply will show up in the form of higher prices for the goods and services produced in low wage industries, and who buys their goods in stores are certainly the poor people. The wealthy are not going to lose their jobs or their businesses.

The way to increase wages is to cut the payroll taxes, cut the capital gains tax, balance the budget, make sure we do not have an increase in inflation, in-

crease the skills of the future work force and current work force, and enact significant regulatory reform.

The debate over minimum wage is a debate about the fundamental principles of government and how our society is to be organized. Unfortunately, the debate has been framed in terms of politics rather than policy. In light of this, I'd like to make three points.

First, as Frederick Bastiat pointed out in 1853, a just government would not interfere in a person's right to contract with someone else for his or her labor services. What this minimum wage legislation will do is to tell the senior that wants to work part-time at the day care center, and 48.5 percent of minimum wage workers are voluntary part-time workers, that she cannot work if the day care center cannot afford to pay her \$5.15 an hour. It says to the black teenager that he cannot try to get a first job, and the training that will go along with it, unless he can produce \$5.15 per hour worth of services. Those who would support the minimum wage must hold the position that the government can tell you at what rate you can sell your labor services. This is not consistent with a just society of free individuals.

Second, an increase in the minimum wage will harm the poor. Increasing the minimum wage must result in workers being laid off and fewer job opportunities. It is just a matter of how many jobs will be lost. Assuming no job losses is equivalent to assuming a perfectly inelastic demand for unskilled labor, which clearly is not the case. Those that wish to increase the minimum wage assume that a majority of the Congress with the approval of the President may decide that those who lose their jobs, or are denied their first job, must suffer this in order to make others better off. But increasing the minimum wage will not make any dent in the poverty rate. Of the 23.5 million adults in poverty, just over 2 percent are working at minimum wage. And increasing the minimum wage will cost the unskilled their job opportunities. Professors Neumark and Wascher, in their paper in Industrial and Labor Relations Review, estimate a 90-cent increase in the minimum wage will destroy more than one-half million unskilled jobs. The unemployment rate among black teenage males is currently greater than 38 percent, while the national rate for adult males is 5 percent. Who is likely to suffer from the loss of low-skilled jobs?

An increase in the minimum wage of 90 cents will raise prices by \$2.2 billion. This price rise will come about because some small businesses in competitive industries will go out of business or produce less. This decrease in supply will show up in the form of higher prices for the goods and services produced in low-wage industries. And who buys their goods at stores staffed by people making minimum wage? Who buys food at restaurants that hire first-time workers? The wealthy are not going to suffer from the higher prices. The wealthy are not going to lose their jobs or their business because of an increase in the minimum wage. But the poor, unskilled, job-seeker, and the small business owner on the edge of making it will suffer. How can we as a Congress claim that we can make the decision that these people must suffer in order for some other people to gain? It is time to admit

that this increase in the minimum wage is an unjust interference of the Government in the lives of the working poor which will cause more harm than good.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 81ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Once again, I join my colleagues and Armenians around the world to honor over 1.5 million Armenians who were killed in this tragic event.

Like every human tragedy, we must retell this terrible story to our children to teach a lesson: Hatred and bigotry must not be tolerated. Instead, as our world grows smaller every day, we must learn to live together in a global village. We must discover and treasure the differences among peoples around the world. We must promote tolerance and understanding. Only then will we have peace. When we remember the Armenian genocide we send a strong message to our global community that violence born of hatred and fear is unacceptable.

While reflecting on the tragedy that began in 1915, our thoughts inevitably turn to a present day tragedy: Bosnia. The world is just beginning to comprehend the atrocities that took place there. The international community is working tirelessly to piece this war torn country back together. However, like those lost in the Armenian genocide, no one can bring back the many precious lives that were lost for no valid reason in the Bosnian War.

I represent a large and active Armenian community in my district. They are hard working and proud of their heritage. As Representatives to the United States Congress, it is our duty to commemorate the Armenian genocide in the hope that future generations will never allow such a callous disregard for human rights to occur again.

RECOGNIZING THE 81ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, April 24, 1996 marks the 81st anniversary of one of the world's most tragic events—the genocide of the Armenian people by the Young Turk government of the Ottoman Empire. The genocidal process which began in the 1890's, came to a peak in 1915 when the Turkish government began a systematic and willful

attempt to wipe out the Armenian population of Anatolia, their historic homeland.

The process continued in 1918 and 1920 when Turkish armies invaded the Armenian Republic in the Caucasus in a heartless attempt to eradicate the remnant of the Armenian people who had taken refuge in a newly freed homeland. The final act of genocide was committed in Smyrna in 1922 when the Turkish Nationalist armies burnt the beautiful coastal city on the Mediterranean and drove its Armenian and Greek population into the sea in full sight of American and other European warships.

In all, over 1.5 million Armenians perished and over 500,000 more were left homeless and driven into exile.

While the Sultan's government, that of Damat Ferit Pasha, directly after World War I held war crime trials and condemned to death the chief perpetrators of that heinous crime against humanity, the vast majority of the culpable were set free. From that day to the present, successive Turk governments have denied the Armenian Genocide and have attempted to spread doubt in the world community.

However, at the time, the United States had consular and embassy officials stationed in strategic locations in the Ottoman Empire and all these officials, including our Ambassador, Henry Morgenthau, reported the intent, the technique, and the results of Ottoman Turkey policy in detail to our own State Department. The records of these officials, demonstrate what the official records of all the European Powers revealed—including Turkey's allies Germany and Austria—that the genocide was a deliberate act on the part of the government to destroy a native ethnic and religious minority whose only crime was to be different.

All victims of man's inhumanity to man have the right to have their fate known and recorded. The survivors have the right to mourn the victims. And the world has the responsibility to see that the crime of genocide does not go unpunished, at the very least to the extent that the perpetrators are held up to universal opprobrium.

Genocide cannot be allowed to be a policy of state. A crime unpunished and unrepented is a crime which can and will be repeated. Even today, as I speak, the present Turkish Government is enforcing a blockade of Armenia blocking American humanitarian assistance from reaching that country. This aid, supported by this Congress, is prevented by the present government of Turkey from being transported to Armenia by land. Such a violation of fundamental principles of humane conduct cannot be allowed to continue.

This issue is not just an abstraction. Every year a substantial number of my constituents who I have known personally for many years, feel deep pain

when April 24 comes about. A pain made worse by the fact that it is ignored by most media and the educated public. This is something that we must not let continue.

Take, for example, the Yessaian family, whose story is recorded in the book, "Out of Turkey," which is distributed by Wayne State University Press. Only six members out of a family of 37 survived the Genocide, and of the six, four had left Turkey prior to the onslaught. One of these survivors is alive today and can recall the heart wrenching experience of seeing his mother and his relatives perish before his very eyes. He still experiences nightmares to this very day.

Suren Aprahamian, also a survivor, has written his memoirs "From Van to Detroit: Surviving the Armenian Genocide," which were published in Ann Arbor, MI. He was among the few survivors of an extended family of over 40 and was forced to watch as old men, women, and other children died one by one due to hunger, thirst, slaughter, and exposure.

Hundreds of other tragic stories of survivors have been preserved on oral history tapes which are on file at the Armenian Research Center of the University of Michigan-Dearborn, directed by another of my constituents, Dr. Dennis R. Papazian. These hundreds of stories, recited by innocent victims, provide a human dimension to the chilling horror of this cataclysm.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there are still many living survivors in my district. The memory of their tragedy still haunts them. They participate each year in commemoration ceremonies fighting against hope that the world will not forget their anguish. Fighting against hope that the present-day Turkish Government will show signs of remorse for a crime committed by their ancestors. Fighting against hope that the United States Government will again show signs of sympathy as it did in 1915-1920.

To me, Mr. Speaker, the Armenian Genocide is not just a footnote in history. It is something that many of my constituents feel very deeply about. It is an issue above politics and partisanship. It is a question of morality.

I am painfully aware of other recent and current acts of genocidal activities being carried on around the world. What began as an exception in the Armenian case, and which then shocked the civilized world, seems to be becoming almost commonplace. It is my belief that when governments are allowed to deny genocide with impunity, and its perpetrators escape punishment, it only encourages this dreadful virus to spread further in the international body politic.

Our Nation's strong support for human rights for all people is more important than ever as we witness the systematic extermination of innocent

people caught up in ethnic and religious conflict.

We cannot let the Armenian Genocide be forgotten. To do so would be to doom future generations to the same curse. Only through remembering the past, and condemning genocide, can we stop such acts of hatred, cruelty and violence from happening again, again, and again.

□ 1815

SIEGE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the current siege on affirmative action. In my home State of Texas, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals recently struck down affirmative action in admissions at the University of Texas Law School in Hopwood versus State of Texas. Then just this week, a Federal judge in Houston temporarily barred the Houston Metropolitan Transit Authority from considering race or sex as factors in awarding contracts. I am very concerned about this case, and I have just asked that the Department of Transportation investigate this decision and the impact it will have on funding for the Houston Metro.

Why are we so quick to eradicate these programs, when it took so many years of struggle to even begin these programs? We should not act impulsively to abandon affirmative action. As long as there is discrimination based on race and gender, we must fashion remedies that take race and gender into account. Race- and gender-conscious remedies have proved essential and remain essential. All Americans want a color- or gender-blind society. That is our goal. But serious discrimination persists and we cannot ignore it.

In the Hopwood versus State of Texas case, the opinion suggested that affirmative action conflicts with merit-based admissions because of small differences in index ratings among nonminority and minority applicants. This is an incorrect definition of merit.

The president of Harvard University, Neil Rudenstine, has said: "Standardized tests do not assess qualities such as competitiveness, decisiveness, creativity, or imagination." Standardized test scores should not be the sole criteria for admissions. The definition of merit should include an assessment of what each student would bring to the learning experience of classmates.

Having a racially and ethnically diverse student body produces benefits for the students, for educational institutions, and for society as a whole. The chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley, one of the most highly regarded schools in the California system said "Excellence and diversity are woven from the same cloth—they are inextricably linked."

The former president of the University of Pennsylvania has said: "The most compelling institutional interest in achieving diversity is the educational necessity of preparing students to live in an increasingly diverse society." Indeed, many students have benefited from affirmative action in education.

It is no accident that as recently as 1974 racial and ethnic minority groups constituted only 1 percent of the University of Texas Law School's student body, while the same groups constituted 30 percent of the State's population. Only a policy of ethnic and race-consciousness led to the 1995-96 presence at the law school of a 17-percent-minority population in a student body that is still 58 percent male and 75 percent white, despite the fact that the State's minority population now stands at 40 percent. Clearly, the school's policy of attempting to insure some degree of diversity, from which everyone benefits, in the student body has not denied, or even appreciably affected the basically white, mostly male character of the school.

The present law of the land for affirmative action in education is the Supreme Court's 1978 decision in Bakke versus Regents of the University of California. This decision established that a university, if it so chose, could employ race as one of the criteria to recruit and bring students of diverse backgrounds into its student population. This is a good rule which should not be rolled back.

I rise today to urge that we do not rush to tear down the affirmative action programs that have been essential in combating the pervasive discrimination that still exists in society today. Let us not roll back affirmative action just when we are beginning to see the benefits to society and business. A commitment to diversity in the work force is simply good business. Opening opportunities helps business compete in a global market and in a multicultural and multiethnic country such as ours.

We should not rush to scapegoat affirmative action as the cause of our economic problems. It is painfully ironic that affirmative action, which was put in place to correct the problems of discrimination, is now seen as a source of injustice. The appropriation of the language of the civil rights movement to now eliminate affirmative action is a perversion of the struggle for equality and justice that so many have fought so hard to begin. If we lose sight of the history of discrimination and injustice, we are doomed to repeat it.

THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, as a proud member of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues and the representative of a large and vibrant community of Armenian-Americans, I rise to remember, to commemorate the Armenian genocide.

First, I would like to commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], coauthors of the caucus, for all their hard work on this issue and other issues of human rights and international decency.

April 24, 1996, marks the 81st anniversary of the beginning of the Armenian genocide. It was on that day in 1915 that over 200 Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders were ar-

rested and subsequently murdered in central Turkey.

This date marks the beginning of an organized campaign by the "Young Turk" government to eliminate the Armenians from the Ottoman Empire. Over the next 8 years, 1.5 million Armenians died at the hands of the Turks, and a half million more were deported.

This tragedy is the first genocide of the 20th century and is well documented. The New York Times alone ran over 194 articles during the Turkish atrocities.

As the United States Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, Henry Morgenthau, Sr., has written: "When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race. They understood this well and made no particular attempt to conceal the fact."

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for Congress to put our government unequivocally on the side of the truth in this tragedy. I commend our colleagues, the gentleman from Michigan, DAVID BONIOR, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, PETER BLUTE, for introducing House Resolution 47, which I have cosponsored. This resolution not only represents official United States recognition of the memory of those who died, but will also put pressure on the Turkish government to do what it has so far callously refused to do: acknowledge and commemorate the atrocities committed over 81 years ago.

We must not condone Turkey's attempts at historical revisionism and denial of the Armenian genocide's occurrence.

Another issue of great importance to Armenia and Armenian-Americans is the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act. Mr. Speaker, I was in Greece several years ago and saw, firsthand, warehouses full of United States humanitarian aid destined Armenia which could not be sent because Turkey was refusing to allow its transport.

While the situation has improved, this hateful practice must not be permitted by this Congress. We have addressed the issue on a temporary basis in the 1996 foreign aid appropriations bill, which included a temporary Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act. We need to make this permanent.

Nothing we can do or say will bring those who perished back to life, but we can imbue their memories with everlasting meaning by teaching the lessons of the Armenian genocide to future generations.

Adolf Hitler, in 1939, cruelly justified the Holocaust with the haunting and hateful words, "Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?"

My fellow Members, tonight we remember the Armenians. We speak for the Armenians, and by doing so we salute their indomitable spirit. By remembering the past, by honoring the

Armenians' martyrdom and sacrifice, we will hopefully prevent similar atrocities in the future.

COMMEMORATING THE 81ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. ESHOO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank Representative PALLONE, Representative PORTER, and all my colleagues participating in raising awareness on this, the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide and the 1.5 million Armenians who were systematically exterminated by Ottoman troops.

The slaughter began on April 24, 1915, when hundreds of Armenian leaders were arrested and executed in Istanbul and other areas.

By the time they were finished, Ottoman troops had executed 1.5 million Armenians including innocent women and children.

Tragically, the voices of these innocent victims fell upon deaf ears because the international community refused to confront the perpetrators of these atrocities.

As the only Member of Congress of Armenian descent, I know full well how the Ottoman Empire decimated a people—my people—and wrote one of the darkest chapters in human history. I'm committed to ensure that the suffering is not diminished, and not be denied by the perpetrators of this disgraceful policy.

By recalling the atrocities of the Armenian Genocide we remind the world that a great tragedy was inflicted upon the Armenian people, that the murder of Armenians was a catastrophe for the entire family of nations, and that unchecked aggression leads to atrocity.

By mourning the losses of our past, we renew our determination to forge a future in which the Armenian people can live in peace, prosperity, and freedom.

Despite the history of suffering at the hands of others, Armenians have remained a strong people, committed to family and united by an enduring faith.

The Armenian people have risen from the ashes of the Armenian Genocide to form a new country from the remains of the Soviet Union * * * a new country which flourishes in the face of severe winters, ongoing military conflict in Nagorno-Karabagh, and the absence of strong international assistance.

Today's Armenia is a living tribute to the indelible courage and perseverance of the Armenian people and the assurance that what took place 81 years ago will not be repeated.

As we remember the tragic history of the Armenian people, it's essential also for us to discuss the future of Armenia

and the role which the United States can play in establishing peace in the Caucasus.

In my view, true peace in the Caucasus will only be achieved when the political and economic isolation of Armenia ceases and regional leaders recognize the inherent rights of Armenia—including its land and its history. Congress can continue to play an important part in this process.

The Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, which became law for fiscal year 1996 as part of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill, is essential because it exerts the appropriate pressure on countries which block U.S. foreign assistance to the region. This measure must be made permanent law as soon as possible, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to do so.

In my view, it's not enough for third party nations to allow commercial flights into aid-recipient countries—land convoys must be allowed through in order to move necessary amounts of American food, medicine, and clothing.

In addition, we must maintain the Freedom of Support Act of 1992. We should reinstate Section 907, which would prevent United States foreign assistance going to Azerbaijan until they lift their blockade of Nagorno-Karabagh. The Freedom of Support Act must be upheld until the isolation of Armenia ends and its territorial rights are adhered to.

Mr. Speaker, if the tragedy of the Armenian genocide has taught us anything, it is sitting back is tantamount to helping Armenia's oppressors.

As Members of Congress, we have the responsibility of ensuring that an enhanced U.S. role in the affairs of the Caucasus follows a course sensitive to the region's history and culture. This includes a heightened sensitivity to Armenia, who's history and culture are often denied or misunderstood.

We must do all we can to prevent this tragic history from repeating itself and help advance a proactive foreign policy to bring lasting peace to the region.

I thank my colleagues who have joined us here today to commemorate the Armenian Genocide.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by saying my remarks also are in memory of someone that was a great leader in the Armenian community, a relative of mine, Aram Bayramian, who was, I think, the essence of what his forefathers were and continue to be, a great American, a great patriot, a man of great faith in family, someone that served this Nation and was devoted not only to the Armenian community but the entire community.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 81ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, today is the sad and solemn day when annually we remember one of the great tragedies of humankind. Today marks the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide, the first genocide of the 20th century.

I have come to the floor of the House today to acknowledge the atrocities suffered by the Armenian people at the hands of the Ottoman Turks. On April 23, 1915, over 200 Armenian religious, political and intellectual leaders were massacred in Turkey. Little did anyone know that April 23, 1915, would signify the beginning of a Turkish campaign to remove the Armenian people from the face of the earth.

Over the following 8 years, 1.5 million Armenians perished, and more than 500,000 were exiled from their homes. Armenian civilization, one of the oldest civilizations, virtually ceased to exist, which, of course, was the Turkish plan.

But despite the brutality, Armenian civilization lives on today. It lives on in the new independent republic of Armenia, and it lives on in communities throughout America, particularly in my home State of California.

Today we honor the innocent Armenians who barely got a chance to see the 20th century. Today we acknowledge that the Ottoman Turks committed genocide against the Armenian people and we demand that his undeniable fact be acknowledged by the current leaders in Istanbul.

I look forward to the day when the world says in one united voice, "We remember the Armenian genocide." Until that date comes, Mr. Speaker, I will continue to stand up with my colleagues to remind the House of Representatives of our responsibility to remember and of our responsibility to speak out against any genocide, past or present.

COMMEMORATING THE 81ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN HOLOCAUST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 81st anniversary of the Armenian Holocaust. On this date in 1915, the Ottoman Empire and the successor Turkish nationalist regime began a brutal policy of deportation and slaughter. Over the next 8 years, 1.5 million Armenians would be ruthlessly massacred at the hands of the Turks, and another 500,000 would have their property confiscated and be driven from their homeland. Engrossed in its own problems at the time, the world did little as a population was devastated.

As these memories stay eternally fresh in their minds and hearts, the

people of the Armenian Republic continue to suffer. In recent years, attempting to establish their independence from the former Soviet Union, Armenia has suffered a series of setbacks, including an earthquake in 1988 and a Turkish-led economic blockade that has prevented humanitarian aid from entering the country.

Despite these tragic circumstances, the Armenian people continue to be an inspiration to people around the world. Indeed, last July's democratic elections and new Constitution are evidence of the Armenian devotion to democracy. At the same time, the Armenian community in the United States and in my home state of Rhode Island continues to enrich our society and culture. They have brought with them their unconquerable spirit, patriotism, and valor. Furthermore, they remind us that we must never forget those who perished 81 years ago. Along with the lives that were lost, the Armenian genocide resulted in the destruction of a society and a culture.

It is the memory of those whose perished that we remember today, but it is also those who have carried on, that we must honor. We know too well that history can repeat itself, and that the problems of far-off nations are often overlooked in the face of larger global issues. While nothing can undo the crime of the Armenian genocide, we can do our best to establish a new future.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this commemoration to remember the victims of this holocaust, pray for those who continue to suffer, and honor the truly inspirational spirit of the Armenian people. We must continue to stand side by side with the Republic of Armenia in her quest for democracy while ensuring that tragedies like the genocide never happen again.

□ 1830

ON THE MINIMUM WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I also want to join briefly, although I will talk about another subject, want to join my colleagues in respect for the human dignity of the Armenian people and hopefully that the tragedy and the history of that event will teach us as public policymakers that we should make sure that that does not happen again.

Mr. Speaker, over the past several days, the public has been privileged to hear the views of Members—from both sides of the aisle—on the issue of raising the minimum wage.

This is a good and healthy exercise. Some of what the public has heard has been fact. However, some has been fiction.

This evening, I would like to address some of the major arguments that have been made and repeated during this debate and attempt to separate the fact from the fiction.

Some have suggested that most minimum wage workers are teenagers, working part-time. That is fiction. Most minimum wage workers are adults—7 out of 10 of them—and most are women—6 out of 10 of them. That is fact. But even if most minimum wage workers are teenagers, should they not be paid a fair day's wage for a fair day's work?

Many maintain that jobs will be lost and prices will rise with an increase in the minimum wage. That is fiction. But many more, including prominent economists, throughout the United States, have effectively disputed the job loss argument.

None on the other side have successfully challenged the three economics Nobel Prize recipients and the more than 100 economic scholars from every corner of America—all who maintain the job loss argument is without foundation.

And, on the issue of rising prices—first, prices have already risen, many times over the past 25 years, while the minimum wage has increased but once.

To the minimum wage worker, price increases combined with no increase in wages has meant more obligations, less money and more misery.

But, second, the claim that an increase in the minimum wage will mean higher prices for goods fails when examined against the experience in New Jersey.

New Jersey, like eight other States, now has a minimum wage higher than the Federal minimum wage.

It has been documented by empirical study, however, that when New Jersey raised its minimum wage, prices were not affected in any measurable way.

Price increase claims are fiction. A few have stated that raising the minimum wage is a liberal Democrat idea—fortunately, that is fiction.

Both Speaker Gingrich and Majority Leader Dole voted for the only minimum wage increase in this quarter of a century in 1989—that is fact.

Moreover, twenty thoughtful Republicans in the House have joined the 113 Democrats in the call for a minimum wage increase—that too is fact.

Mr. Speaker, when the fact is weighed against the fiction, that fact rises and the fiction falls.

An increase in the minimum wage is not a gift—it is not charity. It is just and due compensation for work performed.

How is the value of work measured? That is a difficult question. I can, however, tell you what makes work seem valueless.

Work seems without value when, after doing a job, promptly and thoroughly, an employee earns less than

what is required for basic needs—something to eat, something to wear, a place to stay.

If we are serious about moving citizens from welfare to work, we must make work pay. The public debate over the minimum wage has caused some to rethink their opposition to this vital matter. That is good.

This debate will go on—it will not go away.

Those who continue to watch as corporate profits soar, as the salaries of business managers spiral and as working America suffers, are missing an important moment in history—they are lost in fiction.

An increase in the minimum wage is justified, it is necessitated by conditions and it is the right thing to do—that is fact.

REPUBLICAN PLAN FOR RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, today we have learned that not only are the Republicans opposed to the minimum wage, but their leadership in a joint statement issued today said that they will simply not allow the minimum wage to come to the floor of the House. Instead they will have a substitute package that prevents, prevents millions of Americans from ever getting an increase in the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, if you are a student who is working while you are going to college to help pay for your college education, under their plan you will never get an increase in the minimum wage. If you are a single person who is working at the minimum wage, today you are working 8 hours a day, you are working 40 hours a week, and you are still ending up poor under their plan, you will never get an increase in the minimum wage.

If you are a working person with a child or working person with two children, you will get an increase but you will not get it from the people you are working for. You will get it from the taxpayers, because the Republicans have decided, rather than ask the employers of this country to pay a livable wage, to pay an increase in the minimum wage, what they are going to do is ask the taxpayers to subsidize those jobs for those individuals who are working.

Mind you, today for an individual working at the minimum wage, a single parent with one child, the taxpayers are already paying \$175 a month in AFDC payments, \$28 a month in food stamps, \$179 in EITC, and they are losing \$56 on Social Security. We are already subsidizing low wage jobs in

America. Rather than have the marketplace, which so often we hear people pledge their allegiance to, rather than have the marketplace provide livable wages, rather than have McDonald's or Burger King increase the minimum wage, what they have decided is they are going to provide a government subsidy to those employers.

What that means is never again will McDonald's hire other people other than a single worker because those workers will never be entitled to an increase in the minimum wage. If they hire somebody that happens to have a child, they will know that whatever increases in living standards those people acquire, it will be acquired from the taxpayers, not from their hard work, not from the sweat of their brow and not certainly from their employers.

This is a complete capitulation to the special interests, the restaurant association, the fast food industries, and so many others opposed to an increase in the minimum wage. But now we find out that the Republican leadership in the joint statement of the Speaker and the House majority leader who said they will not bring the minimum wage to the floor of the House of Representatives. They have said that they are also going to go on the attack against the 8-hour day, the 40-hour work week, the Fair Labor Standards Act that protects people that, if you work more than 8 hours a day, if you work more than 40 hours a week, you are entitled to overtime compensation for that work.

What they are going to do is get rid of that standard. They have already done it in the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities where they have voted out legislation to deny people the guarantees of the 8-hour day, the 40-hour work week, and people ought to understand this.

Mr. Speaker, they have also decided that they say they are going to try and protect individuals' pensions. This comes from the same people who just a few months ago allowed people to raid the pension funds of employees. How are they going to provide this increase in the living standards of people who work at the minimum wage? They are going to increase the taxes on low income single working people, on low income students who happen to be single. They are going to tax those individuals, take away their earned income tax credit and give it to poor working people, poor working people who happen to have children.

So we are going to tax the poorest people in the country who are working every day. We are going to tax them and give that to other working poor people who happen to have children. We are going to do that under the Republican plan rather than ask the employers to provide an increase of 90 cents in the minimum wage over 2 years or \$1, as some of our Republican colleagues have suggested, over 2 years.

This is a massive subsidy to employers who choose not to pay the minimum wage. The employer need not show that he cannot pay the minimum wage, that he cannot afford to pay the minimum wage, that their business would go on the rocks. There is no showing at all. You simply do not pay the minimum wage, and the taxpayers come in and subsidize your place of employment. You simply choose not to provide a livable wage to a single person, and that person has no right to any further remuneration because of their work or because of a loss of purchasing power that we have seen people who are currently at the minimum wage.

So what we have is we had a promise by Majority Leader ARMEY that he would fight the minimum wage with every fiber of his being. And now that we see he is carrying out that promise and that promise is in his joint statement that the minimum wage will not come to the floor of the House, they will not allow us to vote on it.

Mr. speaker, we are entitled to that vote. We should have a clean vote up or down on the minimum wage and give the American hard-working people the minimum wage that they need. They need a raise.

GREGORY PECK, FILM LEGEND, SAYS IT ALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would title my short remarks today, "Gregory Peck, Film Legend, Says It All." Here is a small article from a paper last week that film legend Gregory Peck says there is no place for him in Hollywood any longer because today's movies are too full of sex and violence.

The 80-year-old star, looking 10 years younger if not more, still elegant, whose last movie was "Cape Fear," says he is finished. Peck blasted new films for containing gratuitous violence, overt sex, and the massacre of the English language. Even though I know it is all fake, I still do not like to see a bullet going through someone's eyeball, generally in slow motion. He said today's movie heroes are sleazebags. They are motivated by hatred, greed, violence. They are all rude, vulgar, ill-educated, and incapable of making an effort because they are totally selfish and devoid of moral values.

□ 1845

He had especially harsh words for Joe Pesci, the star of "Good Fellows" and "Casino." "He is so far on the anti-hero side that he is almost not human. I myself have played gunslingers, sailors, intellectuals, peasants, and adventurers. I have played Abraham Lincoln

and the terrible Dr. Mengele of Auschwitz, as well as a few drunks and bad boys, but generally, like James Stewart and Gary Cooper, my characters were dignified and brave men who did their duty."

Peck said there is only one decent hero in recent movies: Babe the Pig. In every sense, I thought Babe was a beautiful young lady pig. He said he is in every sense an old-fashioned hero.

Well, I would recommend to Mr. Peck that he see "Braveheart," the film which won Best Director for Mel Gibson and Best Movie of the Year. There, too, was a film where the hero was truly a hero who died with a beautiful word on his lips: freedom.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left? 2½ minutes?

Mr. Speaker, I want to make brief note of something tragic that happened today in the legislative process. Bill Clinton, who successfully avoided serving his country three times, and the last time shamefully, had suppressed and politically destroyed his induction date to the U.S. Army. The exact date is July 28, 1969. He had it politically obliterated by a Senator, a Governor, and by compromising politically the draft board and by completely raping the truth to Col. Eugene Holmes, the head of the ROTC in Arkansas, the University of Arkansas.

So it is particularly offensive to this Air Force officer that my leadership caves to a threat of Bill Clinton back on February 10 when he signed the Defense authorization bill and stripped out three of the best provisions to defend this country in that bill, taking out ballistic missile defense to defend America, our homeland, stripping out the language that no U.S. service men and women would serve under foreign commanders without benefit of treaties, Senate approval or training together like NATO, and that he took out the congressional privileges of this House to decide when men go to fight in World War I or World War II or Somalia or Haiti or Bosnia or Desert Storm or Tibet tomorrow, if that is his whim, to sent the 82d Airborne or the 101st Air Mobile Division.

He said on February 10, after stripping those out, that there was one thing in the bill he was going to encourage disobedience toward, encourage people in the military to sue, and said Janet Reno, his Attorney General, would not enforce the law, and that was BOB DORNAN's language, to mercifully, with medical benefits and an honorable discharge, give about 1,000 people who played Russian roulette with drugs or unsanitary sex, most of it heterosexual, in Navy ports of call with prostitutes around this now very unsanitary world. He said, "That I will undo."

And because of weak Republican leadership and with my own, some of

my leaders, telling me, "But it was authorization on an appropriation conference bill"; no, it was not. It was law. It was a few lame-duck Republicans in the other Chamber and Democrats who are catering to the homosexual lobby not realizing that most of these people are heterosexual victims of HIV that will eventually die of AIDS. They undid law. That is authorizing on an appropriation bill.

So of course I will have to vote against the bill tomorrow. But here is the irony. I am a chairman of military personnel. Tomorrow is my markup. It goes right back in, and here is what I put you on notice, Mr. Speaker. Homosexuals in the military goes in my markup tomorrow. I will win in subcommittee and committee. We are going back to the pre-July 19, 1993, policy, the Reagan-Bush, 50-year policy that this triple draft-dodger tried to undo.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS). The Speaker would like to remind Members that they should avoid personally offensive references to the President.

A MISSED OPPORTUNITY TO RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to vote on the minimum wage. In this place, the Congress sometimes never fails to amaze me. Just when I think I am getting the hang of how things operate, it always pops up and does just the reverse. I thought that because of statements made by Senator DOLE and Speaker GINGRICH in previous remarks, I thought that there would be a vote in this House on this House floor for raising minimum wage, a minimum wage that has not been raised since 1989 and is at its lowest point in buying power in 40 years. I thought there might be an opportunity, and that is what I said today in a news statement.

I thought there would be an opportunity for the 110,000 folks in West Virginia that would see an increase if this minimum wage increase went through, 17 percent of all jobs on the payroll. I thought there would be a chance for them to have a little more takehome pay.

But what I learned today is, in this joint statement of the Speaker and the Republican majority leader, that is not to be. There is not to be a vote on the minimum wage, they say; instead there is to be a reform package.

I want to go through just what this reform package has in it.

The minimum wage increase was real simple: \$4.25 an hour today, which is

what it has been since 1989, to be raised over 2 years to \$5.15. That is all: Flat, simple, fini.

But instead there is not to be a vote on that, says the Republican leadership. Instead there will be a reform package that includes significant family tax relief, including a \$500-per-child tax credit.

Incidentally, what they are not telling you is that one-third of low-income children will never see any benefit from that and that in order to raise the money for it they are going to increase taxes on low-income working people who presently get a tax cut in the earned income credit.

The second part of the reform, so-called reform, package, is quote, "reforming the Earned Income Tax Credit." Well, what that means is that in order to give a little more to some, they are going to take from others in the same status. And, incidentally, that earned income tax credit applies to persons earning somewhere in the neighborhood of less than \$26,000.

They say that they are going to enact reforms to protect employer pensions. Let me tell you about the last reform that they enacted in the reconciliation bill. That was: Did they reform the pension? What they did was make it easier for corporations to go in and raid the pension for certain types of purposes. And so what kind of reform is this if you make it easier to take the pension?

Third: Another one is improvements, that is what this package says, in the labor laws to allow workers to choose flextime. You're darn right you can choose flextime. The last reform that got in the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities is to do away with overtime for over 8 hours' work or over 40 hours in a week. What kind of reform is that? You get to continue earning the old minimum wage and be denied overtime at the same time.

The list goes on.

Mr. Speaker, what the American people want, the overwhelming majority have said clearly: We want a vote on the increase in the minimum wage. Do not load it up. Do not try to clog it up. Do not love it to death by making it a Christmas tree. Do not add a bunch of riders. Vote on raising it from \$4.25 to \$5.15 over a 2-year period.

I know that some say, well, this just goes to students. Well, actually it does not. About half the people are under the age of 25 that would receive a benefit of this, and two-thirds are under the age of 30, and 58 percent are single women, women who are single heads of household.

But as someone who, along with millions of others in this country, worked his way through college at the minimum wage, I can tell you that students need that increase as much as anyone else. Whether it is carrying bedpans, as

I did for 3 years in a hospital, or carrying a tray up two flights of stairs in a restaurant, students are trying to work their way through, young people are trying to get ahead, and the minimum wage is their only way.

I learned a long time ago that as a student and as a young person, as someone working for minimum wage, there was only one collective bargaining agent for me. There were not any labor unions; nobody else was speaking for me. The only way I would ever see an increase was when Congress raised it.

And for those who are afraid that business is going to dry up and go away, the studies indicate that is not so.

But there has not been a minimum wage increase since 1989. Has anyone noticed the Big Mac price going down? How about that pizza that you order from the fast-food catering firm or when you go into any restaurant? You notice those prices going down? Of course you have not.

The fact of the matter is that the minimum wage being raised by this relatively low amount does not influence prices to that degree. And so the fact is, the point is, are we going to give people a working wage? For the 112,000 in West Virginia, 17 percent of our work force who are trying to make it the way the systems tells them to do, working at the minimum wage, they demand, and a lot of other citizens demand, a vote on the minimum wage increase.

THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. As you know, 1.5 million Armenians were massacred by the Turkish Ottoman Empire between 1915 and 1923.

The Armenian community in the United States is mostly descended from survivors of this genocide who were forcibly exiled from their homeland. These citizens, many of whom reside in Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District, have made tremendous contributions to American life while honoring their own rich traditions.

On the evening of April 24, 1915, the political, religious, and intellectual leaders of the Armenian community in Constantinople, now Istanbul, were arrested, exiled from the capital city, and murdered. After the "Young Turk" government silenced the voices of the Armenian community in this horrific way, they began a systematic deportation and extermination of all Armenians.

Mr. Speaker, it is our duty to ensure that these reprehensible crimes against

humanity are not forgotten. I am deeply concerned that the Turkish Government refuses to acknowledge this genocide, even today. We know all too well the consequences of forgetfulness. As Elie Wiesel reports, "Before planning the final solution, Hitler asked, 'Who remembers the Armenians?'"

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. PALLONE and Mr. PORTER for their leadership in sponsoring this special order.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to salute the Pennypack Watershed Association in my district, through its director Tish Ryan, who has done such a great job of bringing people together in environmental education programs, environmental management programs, and especially bringing students together in the 13th District. She has done an outstanding job and should be saluted for her environmental trail blazing.

REMEMBERING THE GENOCIDE OF THE ARMENIANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to speak on a matter that is very close to my heart, to stand with my Armenian friends and brothers and sisters across this country and around the world that today remember their parents and grandparents that were killed in a genocide that existed on April 24, 1915, and for several years following that date. That is a period of time that means so much to the Armenian people throughout the world, and it is a period of time that unquestionably was a genocide against a people simply because of their race, of their religion, and of their heritage, their ethnic heritage, which means so much to that people throughout the world today.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that on the floor of this House that we a few years ago, when I first was elected to the Congress of the United States, refused to acknowledge the word genocide despite the fact that the origin of the actually word genocide came as a result of the witnesses that bore truth to the facts that took place on April 24, 1915.

The truth of the matter is that this has become a highly political debate, a debate that is fueled by modern-day politics that somehow feel the squeeze of the invisible hand of the ancient Ottoman empire that continues to have its hidden hand in the policies that take place on the floor of this House and throughout the world today, and I call upon this administration, the Clinton administration, to acknowledge the fact that a genocide did, in fact, take place on April 24, 1915, and to recognize the tremendous contributions

that the Armenian people continue to make to this country today. We see an unprecedented success story of ethnic heritage and of a completion of a complete taking part in American life by the Armenian people.

□ 1900

A tremendous success story in terms of economic development, a success story that also remembers the roots of the American people. When you look at the kinds of schools, the kinds of language, the newspapers, the fact that in my district today there will be children walking down the streets of Watertown, MA, remembering that their parents and grandparents and great grandparents were killed simply because of who they were, it is important that we today in this House acknowledge the fact that a genocide took place and acknowledge the fact that still today prejudice takes place throughout the world against the Armenian people.

That is why I called upon and saw passed in this House the act which we refer to as the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, that calls upon the Turks to finally open up the borders between Armenia and Turkey, to open up trade between Armenia and Turkey, that talks about the fact that we need to break down the barriers that exist between Azerbaijan and Armenia and the Assyrians, to finally stop the fighting and to finally open up trade so that we can create peace in that region. We need to continue to work through IDA and through the World Bank to make certain that we are providing the necessary humanitarian aid.

Mr. Speaker, I visited Armenia just 2 or 3 years ago in the dead of winter and saw little babies freezing in their own urine inside hospitals where the temperature was 10 or 15 degrees because of the fact that that country has been so cut off from the rest of the world. This is a land that has had the greatest success story of the former Soviet states, and yet today still suffers not because of the drive and determination of the Armenian people, but because we allow and the world allows the prejudice to continue to take place against Armenia by both Turkey as well as Azerbaijan.

So on this date of April 24, let me call upon the people of the United States to remember the tremendous contributions that the Armenian people continue to make to the United States, and let us call upon our own sense of history and heritage to ask that the Russians, to ask that the Turks, to ask that the Assyrians finally come to grips with the true meaning of humanitarianism and provide decent, honorable and open trade with the Armenian people, with the country of Armenia, to bring about a continuation of democracy, a continuation of economic prosperity, and to recognize the tremendous contribu-

tions that the Armenians continue to make throughout the world and most particularly in the United States of America.

COMMEMORATING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in observing the anniversary of the Armenian genocide. I commend my colleagues, Mr. PALLONE and Mr. PORTER, who are leaders in this Congress on Armenian issues and thank them for organizing this special order to draw attention to the tragic slaughter of the Armenian people.

On April 24, 1915, the Armenian people were subjected to a ruthless policy of deportation, property confiscation, slavery, and murder by the Ottoman Empire. This barbaric policy was unquestionably genocide. Over the 8 years between 1915 and 1923, 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children were killed and more than 500,000 more had been forcibly removed from the country. The Ottoman Empire and subsequent Turkish regime engaged in a systematic campaign to destroy cultural and religious monuments, change the names of locations and places, and deny the very existence of the Armenian people in this region.

At the time, the world recognized this crime against humanity and organized a worldwide humanitarian relief effort under the leadership of the United States. It is time for us again to call attention to this genocide.

I have recently joined my colleagues, Mr. PALLONE and Mr. PORTER, in sending a letter to President Clinton urging him to reaffirm the Armenian genocide as a crime against humanity. In addition, I was pleased to work with a number of my colleagues in including the provisions of the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act in the 1996 foreign operations appropriations bill which has been signed into law.

The Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act restricts United States aid to Turkey until the Turkish Government ceases its obstruction of United States humanitarian aid deliveries to Armenia. The foreign operations appropriations bill also provides funds to continue the United States program of humanitarian assistance to the Armenian people.

The Armenian-American descendants of the Armenian exiles make a vibrant contribution to the life and energy of the San Francisco bay area. I join with them today in observing this anniversary of the Armenian genocide and in honoring the memory of their ancestors.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that as we remember these tragic events both of

the Armenian genocide and of the Holocaust, we must remember that there are crimes against humanity that are being perpetrated today. The appropriate tribute to those who have given their lives in the past to these crimes against humanity is to make sure that these acts do not continue and that we must be ever vigilant and speak up against them.

In the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to talk about the minimum wage. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us in this Chamber or all of us who serve in this Chamber would agree that the actions that we take here should serve to build family, to reward work, and to value the American worker.

That is why it is so hard to understand why the Republican leadership in the House is hesitating, indeed has said they probably will not bring up legislation to increase the minimum wage. To remind our colleagues, a person who works full-time at the minimum wage makes \$8,840 a year. In a two-earner household where both parents work, they bring home a rip-roaring \$17,000 a year. For a family of four, this is below the poverty line and indeed below the line of dignity that we owe the American worker.

I am disappointed that the Republican majority will not bring up an increase in the minimum wage, but I am further mystified by the Republican attempt to avoid raising the minimum wage by proposing something which they claim is an increase in the minimum wage combined with an expansion of the earned income tax credit. It is neither. It is simply an attempt to distract attention from the Republican failure to raise the wages of low-income families.

The Republican proposal would cut the earned income tax credit. That means it would increase the tax, if there were a tax, which there is not, so it would serve to put fewer dollars in the pockets of the lowest income people in our country. It would create a three-tiered Federal payment for low-income workers.

This is not only an insult to the American worker, but it is an insult to American business. We are saying to American businesses: We think you do not value the work that your workers do, so we are going to subsidize that work by having a government program to give you money to pay your workers, because obviously you do not value the contribution they make to your business.

What is happening here? How could it be that the Republicans, who talk about reducing the size of government and to promote the free enterprise system, are talking about subsidizing the wages officially that are paid to workers?

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to once again call to our attention, and I

am going to have this blown up for future presentation, how long does it take to make \$8,840. The full-time minimum wage earner, 1 year. What a full-time minimum wage earner makes in 1 year, the average CEO of a large U.S. corporation makes in one half a day. How could this be fair? How could this be just? We salute their entrepreneurial spirit and their success, but we reject the injustice of it all.

CONGRESS SHOULD LINK WELFARE REFORM TO MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate you recognizing me, and I appreciate this opportunity to address what is now a pretty empty and still Chamber, but hopefully some of my colleagues are still following our discussion on the floor this evening.

I intend to talk about a number of very timely issues and concerns, but I want to begin my special order by addressing my colleagues who this evening, most recently just a couple of moments ago the gentlewoman from California, who brought up the minimum wage issue, but prior to her the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] who brought up the minimum wage issue.

I want to also preface my remarks by inviting any of my colleagues who want to discuss any of the issues that I raise tonight to join in this special order. I will be happy to yield time, both to my Republican colleagues on the majority side of the aisle as well as my Democratic colleagues on the minority side of the aisle.

First of all, let me say with respect to the minimum wage issue, I am a little unclear why this has suddenly become—except for the possibility that it is being used now as a political football by the National Democratic Party—why this has become such a pressing issue here in Washington.

Now, do not get me wrong. Back in 1994, while campaigning for Congress, I committed to voting for a modest increase in the minimum wage. It was my feeling back then and it is my feeling today that the minimum wage needs to be increased to keep pace with inflation, and that without an increase in the minimum wage, we will be witnessing a further erosion of the purchasing power of the minimum wage, which is going to put very low-income workers further and further behind the economic curve and exacerbate this growing income gap and I guess you could say this potential economic chasm that is dividing American society.

Just a few weeks ago I was one of seven Republicans who on this floor voted for a procedural motion that would have allowed the House to, at that time and in a timely fashion, consider legislation increasing the minimum wage roughly \$1 over the course of the next year. I am one of 20 or 21 Republicans who supported, who are cosponsoring our own separate free-standing bill, a competing measure to the Democratic bill that would actually raise the minimum wage slightly higher than the legislation proposed by the President and congressional Democrats.

But here is the part about the minimum wage debate I do not get. If this is such an enormous issue and pressing concern to the National Democratic Party, why did they not raise the minimum wage when they had the chance? That is to say, why did they not raise the minimum wage during the last 2 years or prior to last January, when they controlled both houses of the Congress and of course the White House? That is the part I do not get. There is a certain disconnect there because they did not act on legislation raising the minimum wage when they controlled both the legislative and executive branches of government.

Second, I have been maintaining all along and I have attempted to make this case to our leadership, the Republican leadership of the House of Representatives, that a modest increase in the minimum wage needs to be linked to real reform of the welfare system.

It seems to me that we have many perverse incentives in American life today that are the result of misguided Federal policy. For example, we have an economic policy or a tax policy, tax code, that seems to encourage consumption and spending over savings and investment, and that in turn has put a tremendous strain on the so-called old-age retirement programs, social security and Medicare.

But we also have in our welfare system today, especially in my home State of California, which has a fairly lucrative welfare benefit structure, a perverse incentive in that welfare in the aggregate oftentimes pays someone more than what they can make in a minimum wage job. It seems to me to be rather basic, that if we want to reform welfare by moving people from welfare to work, helping them make what is a very difficult transition, especially for single mothers who many times struggle against heroic odds, that we have to raise the minimum wage so that at least the minimum wage pays more than welfare benefits.

The gentlewoman from California was absolutely right in the statistics that she quoted. Unfortunately, she walked off the floor because I do not think she wants to engage in a debate about this issue. She is right, though, when she says that a full-time minimum-wage worker today would earn

only \$8,840 a year, which is far less than many States pay in welfare cash benefits and well below the Nation's poverty level.

It is my belief that we need to correct this inequity, an inequity that the Democrat majority in the last Congress was unwilling to address, so that people who want to work are not forced to choose between work and welfare because welfare actually pays better than work. So again, it seems to me we have to reverse that equation, address this perverse incentive, which is one of many that riddle American life today.

The other point I wanted to make on the minimum wage issue, watching, I believe it was, a CNN program over the weekend, their Inside Edition on late Sunday afternoon, early Sunday evening, they were profiling the Republican revolution after 15, 16 months of this Congress and sort of begging the question, is that revolution alive or dead?

□ 1915

They focused specifically on the subject of welfare reform, and they actually interviewed several current welfare recipients who, looking right into the camera, said "I don't feel that I can support myself, much less my family"; that is, meet the needs of my dependents and loved ones in an entry level minimum wage job; that is to say, a job probably in the service sector of the economy, the kind of job that they would be most likely to find if they were to move from the welfare rolls to work now.

So there you have it. You have living, firsthand testimony, from several people right on that show Sunday evening, basically saying what I think many of us believe, and that is that we have to again address this perverse incentive, and we have, if we want to reform welfare by moving people from welfare to work, make a minimum wage job pay more than welfare benefits in the aggregate.

But that is the other party with a little bit of the grandstanding going on on the other side of the aisle with this particular issue. Again, I am trying to make a linkage to real reform of the welfare system. That is my rationale or justification for supporting an increase in the minimum wage, yet I think anyone who has followed the debate in this Chamber and the developments in this Congress, the 104th session of Congress in our Nation's history over the last 16 months, knows that while we promised in our Contract With America to reform the welfare system, to emphasize work, families and personal responsibility, we have gotten virtually no assistance from our Democratic colleagues in that effort in either the House or the Senate. In fact, we have already in these past 16 months, this session of Congress, sent the President two welfare reform bills which he has vetoed.

So here you have a certain irony in a Republican majority in this Congress trying to help this Democratic President, who back in 1992 as Candidate Clinton promised to end welfare as we know it, make good on that campaign promise. Yet he has refused to consider welfare reform legislation. I believe personally the President would have a political problem with the far left wing of his party, and this political constituency of dependency that we have built up in America over the last several decades, if he were to entertain signing welfare reform legislation, again, despite the promise he made back in the 1992 campaign for President, which was just one of several major promises that he has broken to date in his last 3-plus years as President of these United States.

We all remember, of course, back in the 1992 campaign when he promised to submit to the Congress a budget that balances in 5 years. Many of us recall he made a middle class tax cut the centerpiece of his economic plan, which he called putting people first. Of course, as I said a couple of months ago, he also campaigned on a promise of ending welfare as we know it, which made him look the centrist, new Democrat that he wanted to be during the 1992 election. But, of course, as the record now shows, he has tended to govern more as a traditional left wing, big government, tax and spend President.

So I find some of the rhetoric coming from my Democratic colleagues just a little disingenuous on this issue, because again I do not see how you divorce or separate an increase in the minimum wage from real reform of the welfare system, particularly if it is a bipartisan goal of both the Congress and the Presidency to try and help people make that transition from welfare to work.

We know that those experiments in welfare are succeeding around the country. Many States, including Virginia, just across the Potomac River, where I reside part-time while serving back here in Washington representing the 1st Congressional District of California, Virginia has launched a welfare program, welfare reform, over the last year or so, which to date has been a tremendous success. In fact, there was just a story in today's newspapers back here documenting again the success stories of those people who with the proper assistance from the Government in the form of education, skills training or job training, adequate child care and transportation, are making that transition from welfare to work. But, again, I submit to you that if we wanted to have large scale welfare reform, if we really do want to pursue this dream or this vision of ending welfare as we know it, we certainly have to make an entry level minimum wage job pay more than welfare benefits in the aggregate.

So again, I find just a little tad of hypocrisy in what some of my Democratic colleagues have had to say on the floor this evening, and on certainly prior occasions, with respect to the minimum wage issue, and I look forward to the coming debate on the minimum wage issue, so that we can hopefully constructively discuss the minimum wage, how we can move that legislation through the House. Again, I would like to see it move in the context of welfare reform.

There is one other thing I want to mention about welfare reform, and that is earlier this year, I think it was back in January or February of this year, we saw in this town a truly remarkable event. Now, I know that people tend to get, particularly the longer they stay back here in Washington, they tend to succumb to sort of the beltway culture. They become just a tad cynical, maybe just a little jaded. But we saw something earlier this year that even the most jaded Washingtonian, even the most skeptical pundit, I think would have to admit was truly a remarkable development, and that is when the Nation's Governors, meeting back herein Washington at their semi-annual meeting, unanimously agreed on welfare reform proposals.

Unanimously. I did not say this was a consensus agreement, where a majority prevailed obviously over a minority in supporting and advancing welfare reform proposals. No, this was a unanimous agreement. We had 43 of the Nation's Governors, big State, little State, Democrat and Republican, meeting back here, all endorsing the welfare reform proposals.

Since that time, the other seven Governors have also endorsed those proposals, so we have the remarkable, the absolutely remarkable development of unanimity in the ranks of the Nation's Governors, all 50, again, big State, little State, Republican and Democrat, supporting welfare reform proposals.

I wonder just for a moment, in a perfect world, what would happen if we were to attach the minimum wage increase that, again, 20 or 21 of us Republicans and a solid majority of the Democrats in the House, to those unanimous welfare reform proposals of the Nation's Governors? Would that not give us the opportunity to do something on a truly bipartisan basis that we could be really genuinely proud of and which might stand as one of the shining accomplishments of this Congress, the 104th in our Nation's history?

TRIBUTE TO GILBERT MURRAY

Mr. Speaker, I want to change subjects for just a moment and explain why I am wearing this green ribbon on my lapel, which is a question I have been asked many times today by many of my colleagues. I also want to acknowledge that hearing the comments of my colleagues earlier this evening,

both sides of the aisle, talking about the reflecting upon the genocide in Eastern Europe that dates back a considerable amount of time, that on these kind of occasions, when Members stand in tribute, I think the Chamber takes on really its most formal and solemn atmosphere.

I want to follow that by mentioning that this green ribbon on my lapel is in memory of a man by the name of Gilbert Murray, Gil Murray, who 1 year ago today, on April 24, 1995, was killed in his office of the California Forestry Association in Sacramento, CA, by a seemingly innocuous mail package. We now know 1 year later that Gil was tragically the last victim of the so-called Unabomber.

I did not know him well, but as I knew him, he was a fine man, a family man, a dedicated professional, someone who was advancing the principles of responsible and sustainable forestry on both our public and private forest lands. I can tell you that Gil, 1 year later, is very much missed by his friends and his family certainly, and those of us who had the privilege of knowing him.

Now, I suspect that his death is something his family can never truly recover from, but I hope and I pray that they continue to heal from this tragic event, and that we all remember April 24, 1995, as a day that will forever change the way each of us look at our own lives and the world in which we live.

We can, of course, now today, April 24, 1996, take some solace knowing that with the apprehension of an individual who is strongly suspected of being the infamous Unabomber, no other families will suffer the tragedy of losing a friend and loved one like the way we lost Gil.

One year after his tragic death, the memory of Gil still touches those of us who work on forestry and resource issues on a daily basis. His death touches us deeply, and our love and affection go out again to his family, his friends, his extended family, if you will, which would certainly include the other fine folks at the California Forestry Association.

I hope we never forget his tragic death, because it was a senseless and evil act. Again, I personally asked a number of my colleagues today to show their solidarity and their respect for Gil by wearing a green ribbon on their lapel, such as I am doing now, and I am very pleased that so many of my colleagues would join me in this effort. Really, in their own way, or by extension, they honor all the victims of the Unabomber and their survivors.

I want to do one other thing that is related to Gil Murray's passing, and that is I want to address some of this, because I think Gil would approve of this, I want to address some of this environmental fear mongering and

hysteria that we have been hearing in the halls of Congress in recent days and weeks. It sort of came to a head I guess on Monday of this week, Monday, April 22, the so-called National Earth Day, when we heard all kind of exaggerated and wild-eyed claims being made down here on this floor that, again, I think can only be described as environmental fear mongering or hysteria.

I think most of us, particularly those of us who live in the western United States and who represent resource-dependent congressional districts, that is to say, represent communities where the economy is based on resource use and development, most of us know that you have to find a balance between the need to protect the environment on the one hand, and the need to protect jobs on the other. We strive to find that balance in our congressional districts and certainly here on the floor of Congress when we, in our everyday professional lives, as we make policy decisions.

So I tend I guess over time to just sort of tune out this environmental fear mongering and hysteria. But when I hear Members, especially from the other side of the aisle, coming down to the floor, and let us be honest about it, most of them, and I am not going to name names, particularly since they do not have the opportunity to be here and debate the issues, but most of them come from metropolitan areas, they represent urban congressional districts where the thinking on environmental issues is about 180 degrees different than the more rural areas of America, like the district that I represent.

But I heard several of these Members come to the floor the other day and refer to our timber salvage legislation, the legislation authorizing the Forest Service to sell more of the dead, dying, and diseased trees on Federal forest lands, and referring to that legislation as so-called logging without laws.

Now, I want to be very clear about one thing. We are talking about logging, selective harvesting, of dead, dying, and diseased trees on Federal forest lands. Not in our national parks, not in our wilderness areas, not in an area that has a wild and scenic designation, but in our Federal forest lands, these vast forest preserves that were set aside in the 1940's in part to provide a growing Nation with a very valuable commodity and a steady supply of timber.

It just seemed prudent to those of us in the Committee on Appropriations who wrote this legislation that we ought to allow greater harvesting of the dead, dying, and diseased trees, if for no other reason than to deal with the tremendous fuel load, the buildup of combustible materials, the underbrush and downed trees, on Federal forest lands, particularly when just a couple of summers ago we saw wild fires

raging out of control in our drought-stricken forests of the western United States, wild fires that I might add cost the taxpayer \$1.1 billion and took the lives of 33 U.S. firefighters attempting to extinguish those fires.

□ 1930

So, Mr. Speaker, we thought we had a good bill, yet it has been called logging without laws, and we saw Members stand here on the floor and the other side of the aisle demagoging this issue, handing out fig leaves and saying, and this is an actual quote, "Let's not be conned", yet today a three-judge court of appeals upheld the timber salvage law. They said it was perfectly legal. It is not logging without laws. And at least one of the three judges is an appointee of President Clinton.

They specifically upheld the so-called 318 green sales provisions of this particular bill. This is the section of the timber salvage legislation that directed the Forest Service or the Federal Government to honor contractual sales commitments that had been made to private parties who had successfully bid for the rights to harvest trees on Federal forestlands in the Pacific Northwest, in Oregon and Washington. And the three-judge court of appeals today simply said that the Federal Government, in fact, will honor its longstanding legal obligations and proceed with those sales.

So there is no logging without laws. We know that, sadly, that right now, today, April 24, we are operating a portion of the Federal Government on a 24-hour so-called continuing resolution. This is a short-term funding measure for 5 of the 13 annual spending bills, which we call appropriations, that have not yet been enacted into law. And we are down to resolving, those of us who have been a party to these negotiations, as I have, as an individual member of the House Committee on Appropriations, we are down to just a few issues really now dividing us in this House, Republican Majority, Democrat Minority, and between the Congress and the White House. But those few issues have to do with the so-called environmental riders to the Interior appropriations bill, which is one of the five bills, again, not yet enacted into law.

And these were provisions that, again, Members were talking about here on this floor just a couple of days ago, on Earth Day, Monday. What are they? They are the idea of allowing expanded oil drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and expanded timber harvesting in the Tongass National Forest of Florida.

We have Members running down here constantly claiming that by expanding oil drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, and bear in mind this is a very small portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, it is presently

set aside for oil leasing and drilling, all the remainder staying as wilderness, and by expanding harvesting in the Tongass Forest, which is again surrounded by vast tracts, huge amounts of land, I mean hundreds of thousands of acres of wilderness, and by the way these are areas that maybe a handful of Members of Congress have ever visited; I must confess I have never visited them. But we want slightly increased resource use in Alaska, for one reason and one reason only, and that is the duly elected representatives of the State of Alaska, Congressman DON YOUNG, Congressman for all of Alaska, and the two United States Senators representing Alaska are strongly supporting these provisions. And one would presume since they have been duly elected by the people of Alaska that they have a support of the majority of Alaskans; yet by trying to pursue these provisions, we are then accused by the other side of attempting to gut environmental regulations.

Then they mention the Endangered Species Act. And, yes, it is true in the annual appropriations bill, one of the appropriation bills last year, we imposed a moratorium on the listing of any new endangered or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act. Now why would we do that? We have been accused of being radical by doing that. But what the other side never points out is that the Endangered Species Act is no longer authorized. The congressional authorization of the Endangered Species Act expired over 2 years ago. Rather than this law simply sunset, going off the books, it has remained in effect only because the Congress, the House specifically, would appropriate money on an annual basis to the Federal agencies which enforce that law; again, even though the original law itself, the statute, is no longer authorized. The authorization expired, again, over 2 years ago.

That sort of begs the question: Why didn't the last Congress, which was controlled by the Democratic Party, bring a reauthorization bill of the Endangered Species Act to this floor? And the answer is simple. Had they done it, there would be a bipartisan majority of Members, Republicans and Democrats, who would have wanted to amend the Endangered Species Act to include greater protection for jobs and greater consideration of the economic consequences of listing decisions. Again, trying to find that elusive balance between the need to protect species on the one hand and the need to consider and, hopefully, mitigate economic consequences and potential job losses on the other hand.

I do not think that is so radical. So, again, we have demagogue going on in this House without the American people really being told both sides of the issue, not getting the full picture.

Lastly, one of the things that I wanted to mention on the environment is

that earlier in this session of Congress, in fact during the first 100 days in this session of Congress, we passed by an overwhelming bipartisan majority in this House one of the provisions of the Contract With America that was signed into law by the President. We have this impression a lot of our Democratic colleagues would like to leave with the American people that the Contract With America is very radical. The reality is that 9 out of 10 provisions passed this House, 9 out of 10 provisions in the Contract With America passed this House and they passed this House, in many, many instances, with very strong support from the Democratic Members of the House. And one of those provisions, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, became law with the President's signature.

How could that be? That is one provision in the Contract With America, passed the House, passed the Senate, and was signed into law by the President. And that is radical?

That Unfunded Mandates Reform Act created a new commission, actually there was an existing commission within the Federal Government, but it gave them a new charge and that was to examine existing Federal laws to determine whether those existing laws constitute an unfunded, or perhaps a better word would be underfunded mandate, imposed on States and local communities by the Federal Government. In my view, it is sort of a heavy-handed, top-down, one-size-fits-all fashion, and of course we continue to write laws back here with the arrogance that, you know, the law is going to work as good in Portland, OR, as it does in Portland, ME. And sometimes I think we are sadly mistaken in that belief.

But we passed this Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. It became law. And the Unfunded Mandates Commission then began looking at existing Federal laws. And do you know what they found? They found that Federal environmental regulations, and they were very specific, they named the Endangered Species Act, they named the Clean Water Act, they named the Clean Air Act, they named the Superfund law and several others, that those existing Federal environmental regulations constitute, surprise, an unfunded mandate imposed on State and local communities by the Federal Government.

Furthermore, the unfunded mandates panel called on the Congress to rewrite these laws, to give greater consideration to the concerns of and the impacts upon States and local communities and to give States and local communities more of a say in the writing of these laws and in the administration of these laws. Since, again, we pass that responsibility for administering these laws on down to the States and to local communities.

And that is the flexibility that the State and local communities have been

screaming for for years. That is why we passed the Clean Water Act Amendments in this House. And so many of our Democratic colleagues would have the American people believe that we passed the Clean Water Act Amendments because we are beholden to big business and corporate special interest. Well, to the contrary. The real impetus for amending the Clean Water Act came from the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, both bipartisan organizations representing locally elected officials.

So I get a little tired when I hear this environmental fearmongering, this hysteria. I recognize it for what it is. It is a good political issue in a Presidential election year, but I think we are, by giving this hysteria any credence, we are really deceiving, mis-serving, or doing a disservice to the American people.

I want to read you very quickly a letter that appeared in a publication called *Green Speak*, that is put out by the National Hardwood Lumber Association. It is a letter from a mutual friend of mine and Gil Murray, again, the last victim of the Unabomber, for whom I wear a green lapel ribbon this evening. A mutual friend of ours by the name of Nadine Bailey, who was very involved just a couple of years ago, she lives just outside my congressional district, actually in Congressman HERGER's congressional district in northeast California, in a little mill town called Hayfork, and her letter is dated March 11, 1996 and it is an open letter to the President.

It says, "Dear President Clinton, you made a promise to my daughter on a national television program."

This actually was the televised proceedings of the so-called forestry conference or timber summit held out in Portland, OR. I guess this would have been early 1993, soon after the President was elected, and both the President and the Vice President attended that particular timber summit or forestry conference, and Nadine starts her letter by making reference to it.

She then goes on to say "When Elizabeth", her daughter, "showed you her class yearbook, with the names of the children whose parents would lose their jobs because of the spotted owl", and of course those of us who hail from northwest California and the Pacific Northwest, we know very well about the spotted owl because it is listed as an endangered species and has had a tremendous impact on the economic well-being of our communities in northwest California, the Pacific Northwest.

"You made a promise to her and to all the children who live in timber-dependent communities. Do you remember what you said? Your promise was that you would solve the problems in the northwest and California, that you would bring everyone together and come up with a solution that would

allow logging and protect the spotted owl. Do you remember? Do you care where Elizabeth is today? Do you care where her father is? Do you know how hard her family worked to bring about solutions that would save the community and ensure the health of the forest?

"I hope this brief summary of the last 3 years," the first 3 years of the Clinton administration, "will make you understand and regret your broken promise."

So this would be a broken promise that follows on the heel of the broken promise to balance the Federal budget, to end welfare as we know it, and to give the middle class a tax cut.

"1993. After the summit, I worked with the environmental community to develop a plan that would add jobs while protecting habitat and wildlife. I received a call from Vice President GORE asking for my support for the Option 9 forest plan."

"1993 to 1994." Two-year period. "The Option 9 plan is approved and the region gets an adaptive management area. These areas were specifically designated to have adaptive management techniques used to produce products that would enable local communities to survive the transition brought about by changes in forest management. Hopes are high in the region that some relief from the timber supply crisis will be felt."

"Spring 1994. Jobs become hard to find. Grants from Option 9 do not make their way to unemployed loggers. In fact, in public forums," your forestry policy adviser, "Tom Tuchman admits much of the money will go to infrastructure. In other words, the people most affected by the change in national forest policy will be the least likely to receive help. We no longer have our business. Years of work to build a business are gone, and my husband, Walley, works for five different employers, some as far away as 8 hours. Families are starting to leave the Trinity area. Some Trinity County School districts now have 96 percent of their children on free and reduced lunches, which means they now live below the poverty level."

"Fall 1994. The last large logger in Hayfork prepares to move operation because of lack of work." What she really meant to say was the lack of harvestable trees, or timber. The adaptive management area fails to produce any more timber than other areas under Option 9. In fact, there seems to be more study in the adaptive management area than other areas affected by the Option 9 plan."

"Spring 1995. We move our family from our home in Hayfork to Redding. At this point I contacted the many agencies that have been given money to help displaced workers for help with the move. We were told that we that we didn't qualify because my husband

already has found work. We are forced to borrow money from a family member to move. We had been homeowners, now we are faced with renting and finding \$2,000 needed for deposits. We cannot sell our home, partly because of the market and partly because the house was built by my mother and father and I cannot face losing my home."

□ 1945

Wally, my husband, becomes even more bitter about being betrayed by your administration. Despite my job at the California Forestry Association, we fall deeper in debt. My kids are not happy. City life in Sacramento or in Redding is much different. To leave a high school with 125 kids and start again in a high school with 1,000 is almost too much for country kids. I am very concerned about Elizabeth. She misses her friends so much. Wally finds work 6 hours from home. He moves out to live on the job site and I become a single mother again.

April 24, 1995, the date that I observe this evening, a bomb goes off at my office, killing my boss and friend, Gil Murray. I seem to have lost the heart to fight for our community. Nothing I have done in these last 4 years seems to have made a difference. My trust in Government and society as a whole is weakened. You use the Oklahoma bombings to attack right wing political groups. You never mentioned the Unabomber. Vice President GORE doesn't call this time.

Let me just parenthetically ask if anyone sees anything wrong with the fact that of course the President and some of his political allies have no hesitation or reservations about insinuating that somehow, some way the National Rifle Association and Rush Limbaugh might have been responsible for the very tragic, horrific Oklahoma City bombing, but yet they see no possible connection between the rantings of the Unabomber and the environmental hysteria that goes on in this Chamber with regularity or for that matter no connection between some of the things that Vice President GORE has written and some of the writings of the Unabomber himself.

Summer 1995, where did I go wrong? Was it in believing in your promises? Could I have done more? Everything is beginning to unravel. With the exception of some local groups that came together to seek solutions through consensus, like the Quincy Library Group in Quincy, California, everyone seems to be going back to war.

By that she means the timber wars which have polarized our communities and divided the environmental camp from folks who make their living in the forest products industry, either directly or indirectly:

I wonder if you realize what an opportunity you had to heal old wounds. Instead all hope is fading for the future of towns like Hayfork. I still get calls late at night from people not knowing how they will make it through the winter, wanting to know if they should stick it out, if there is any hope that things will change. For the first time in my life, I have no hope.

That is what Nadine, she goes on and wrote a few other personal comments about her family. She actually ended up moving to Wisconsin where she now works at the timber producers office of Wisconsin.

But it is a very, very sad commentary about our inability to find that balance, the balance really that was promised, I believe, by the President and Vice President when they convened this timber summit in Portland, the balance that was promised to communities like Hayfork and to families like Nadine Bailey's.

I wonder where all this is going to lead, because in today's paper, in the San Francisco Chronicle, on page 1 is a headline that says, Victory for Sierra Club Dissidents. I think most people know that the Sierra Club, with roughly 600,000 members, is probably the largest environmental organization in the country. It has become a major environmental organization, no question about it. They have a full-time professional lobby here in Washington and in State capitals around the country. And they have an energetic grass-roots membership.

The point I am getting at is that they also enjoy this image of being moderates on the environment, reasonable people, people that you can sit down and talk with and maybe hopefully reason with as we grapple with these very, very complex and difficult and seemingly intractable issues. But the headline says, Victory for Sierra Club Dissidents and then it goes on, the subhead is, Vote to ban logging in national forests, Vote to ban logging in national forests.

Now, I know some of my constituents do not like it when I say this, but I ask repeatedly, as someone who is very proud of my role in helping to make the timber salvage legislation law, what is more extreme? Harvesting dead, dying and diseased trees in our national forests, which the foresters, like the late Gil Murray tell us is good for forest health and for fire suppression purposes and, I might add, it makes, to me, certain economic sense to use those dead, dying and diseased trees to produce a much-needed resource, while those dead, dying and diseased trees still have some economic and monetary value. I have yet to encounter too many Americans who do not live in wood framed structures. And I would also point out that if we followed the lead of the Sierra Club, this moderate, reasonable, middle-of-the-road environmental organization and we banned all logging in national forests, not national parks, not wilderness areas, national forests, that that will only increase the pressure to harvest trees on privately owned lands and that we need to find that equilibrium, that balance between a sustainable timber harvest on public lands and a sustainable timber harvest on private lands.

If we follow their lead and we ban all logging on our national forests, in essence turning our Federal forest into additional national parks, then we will, in my view, not only increase the pressure to harvest on private land but we

will be creating a tremendous fire hazard in those Federal forest lands, particularly in our drought-stricken areas of the western United States.

So what is more extreme? Harvesting dead, dying and diseased trees to produce a resource, or those who are so opposed to timber harvesting that they do not want to harvest even a dead tree? I wonder. Because leading the pack in this whole debate back here, of course, is the Vice President, AL GORE and the Secretary of the Interior, Secretary Babbitt.

So I believe it is a very, very alarming and sad day, and I wonder about the terrible irony of the Sierra Club taking this particular position on the same day that we commemorate the tragic death of Gil Murray.

In fact, I should mention, the article goes on to say, Members of the Sierra Club have handed a dissident faction, it is no longer a dissident faction because they prevailed, they are now the majority within the club, handed a dissident faction an important victory by voting that the club for the first time in its 104 year history will support an end to commercial logging in national forests. The club's membership approved the measure 2 to 1, the San Francisco based conservation organization announced yesterday. Although the club has fought vigorously against logging in many situations, it has never formally opposed an outright ban on the common practice of commercial logging in national forests.

So the Sierra Club is now coming out and taking a position that we will not even thin these forests to selectively harvest the dead, dying and diseased trees. We will have no timber harvest in our Federal forest lands at all, even though that was largely the reason that those Federal forest lands were created to begin with.

So I mentioned the Vice President because I think a lot of this is, particularly the current impasse over the budget, the so-called omnibus appropriations bill, the conference report which we would like to bring to this floor tomorrow, a lot of this impasse right now is again over environmental issues.

I think my colleague, Mrs. SEASTRAND, would admit that. I will yield to her in just a moment. But to me it continues a very disturbing pattern back here in Washington of demagoging on issues. I take very strong exception to the demagoging that I see going on. I know it is a sad fact of political life. I know that we are going to see more, not less, as we approach the November election. But there are some issues that in my view are too important for this sort of common, everyday petty politics and this demagoging back and forth.

Let me give you one other example. That is Medicare, because a lot of the demagoging that we hear coming from

the other side of the aisle in the Congress and from the Clinton administration has to do with the environment, Medicare, education. I think those are the three big ones that they like to hit all the time. So I want to mention Medicare.

I want to first of all just point out for my colleagues just how out of hand this demagoging is. This is an April 19, so this is a Congress Daily from last week, that reports on a press conference over on the other side of the Capitol outside the Senate Chamber where the Vice President was quoted as blasting Senator DOLE and Senate Republicans for attempting to push on, this is a quote, Push on the U.S. Senate a provision that would have led to serious and grave damage to the Medicare system.

There were just two problems: One, the amendment that the Vice President was referring to, having to do with medical savings accounts, had nothing to do with Medicare; it was in the context of health insurance reform. No. 2, Senator DOLE himself was standing behind the Vice President when the Vice President made these particular remarks. It is almost as if, again, certain figures in the administration cannot wait to demagogue an issue. And it is sort of the old mindset that my mind is made up, do not confuse me with the facts.

It had nothing to do with Medicare. It had to do with the health insurance reform legislation that we would like to move through Congress on a bipartisan basis and get to the President so he can sign.

But here, Mr. Vice President and other concerned colleagues, here is the real issue pertaining to Medicare, and that is the very stark headlines just out of yesterday's newspaper. I do not understand why, if we are going to have these Chicken Little folks running all over the Capitol saying the sky is falling, the sky is falling let us shift our focus from the environment and start talking about something that is really of crucial concern to this Nation and future generations; that is, Medicare.

It is going broke. It is going broke faster than expected. And we need to do something in this session of Congress about the problem. We have already sent the President a plan that would increase Medicare spending per recipient from \$4,800 today to \$7,300 per Medicare recipient in 7 years, increase spending, increase choices, and save the program from bankruptcy. But President Clinton vetoed that legislation, as we all know now.

But here is what is so alarming, because the facts and figures indicate the truth and we can see a trend developing. Back on February 5 of this year, February 5, 1996, the New York Times reported on page A1 with a Washington dateline, Washington, New government

data shows Medicare's hospital insurance trust fund lost money last year for the first time since 1972, suggesting that the financial condition of the Medicare Program was worse than assumed by either Congress or the Clinton administration.

Then, as I mentioned, again, the New York Times yesterday, April 23, 1996, again on page A1, the New York Times is not exactly a conservative publication.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. It was most interesting to see that New York Times article appears in the Santa Barbara News Press. The Santa Barbara News Press is owned by the New York Times, and to see the headline stating that Medicare is going broke faster than we here in the Congress think that it will go broke, \$4.2 billion, it was interesting because the subheadline on the front page of that newspaper said that the Clinton administration was very much trying to cover up the calculations.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from northern California would agree with me that through all of this discussion, on trying to save Medicare for our moms and dads and for future generations, we have taken quite a bit of heat, not from necessarily the folks in the district but from those outside forces that come from Washington, DC. I know the gentleman is, like I am, one who has been besieged by television, radio ads, coming from Washington, DC, and trying to tell constituents in our district that the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and the gentleman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND] were trying to cut and destroy Medicare, and so it is a little sad to see those headlines.

Mr. Speaker, when you take the stand, you argue your positions and you do battle. It is sad to, while I enjoy seeing the headline saying, yes, I was right, Mr. RIGGS of California was right, we support our bill to save Medicare. But when you do realize how much the people, our senior citizens presently, our children and our grandchildren are going to suffer just because of the fact that politics is played, demagoguery was taking place, and we did not get about to saving Medicare as of yet.

So, I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS]. It is a pretty sad day, but it is interesting to see that it has to be true. I mean that headline appeared in all of our newspapers across this land. I just say, if it is in the New York Times, I just guess it has to be true.

I think Mr. RIGGS would agree with me that we are being besieged. The gentleman was talking earlier about fear mongering, and it is interesting because the same ads have appeared in

my district that have appeared in the gentleman's district, with the same 800 number. Whether it was some of the more extreme groups trying to scare our constituents that we are trying to poison the water, we have lead in the water and arsenic in the water, and we are going to pollute our oceans, I would just stand here, saying as a mom and one who hopes one day very soon to be a grandmother, I am definitely concerned about our environment and where we are going as we turn into the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, so it is a bit bizarre. But to see the fear mongering not only from different organizations but amazingly the AFL-CIO, I think they played the same ad that we re definitely cutting into Medicare, destroying Medicare, cutting education.

□ 2000

They were destroying the environment, and we voted for a bad budget, and it is just interesting to note that again this fear is coming from the heart of this city, Washington, DC.

We know, it is those big labor bosses that are very, very disturbed that they lost power, and they do not seem to wield it here in this capital city as much as they used to for 40 years.

But, you know, when you were talking about not having the opportunity to do some timber salvaging in our national forest, I was thinking about how many working families, by that position that the Sierra Club took, how many working families it is going to affect in your district, and I often think, too, about the AFL-CIO, how many people because of their positions where I am trying to fight for a balanced budget to help my children and grandchildren and yours and taking the position of tax relief, of \$500 tax credit for children, seeing that we cut through capital gains so we could help those small businesses in the northern end of California and on my central coast; all these things that are so important for our working families throughout our two districts, and because of the rhetoric, the yelling of radical extremists, how many, because of that, how is it going to affect our district and affect those very working families that belong to the very so-called AFL-CIO union.

And when you think just recently they had an annual convention here in Washington, DC, and they raised the dues of those working families in my district, in your district, and they are going to have to pay for those dues to fund a continuation of the fearmongering advertising that is taking place in our districts.

I have a quote here. At the convention, we had vice president Linda Chavez Thompson say, "We stopped the Contract with America dead in its tracks. Now we have to spend 7 times as much to bury it 6 feet under."

I tried to talk to my working families in my district and say the Contract with America; what is that? That is balancing the budget so that we can lower those interest rates so you can buy that home that you want to buy or buy that truck that you need, or to send your children to college so maybe they are going to be the first to graduate out of your family. Or it means tax relief, that \$500 tax credit, or a tax credit for adoption of our children. Or it might mean welfare reform or saving, just cutting away at the big bureaucracy here in Washington, and I think the gentleman would agree with me that we are trying our very best to bring some sanity, and yet the rhetoric is very strong, especially on two freshmen.

And I just might say in this week we are commemorating Earth Day and talking about the environment. I will just say to the gentleman from northern California, you have been recycled as a Member of this Congress, and very gladly, because you served in this Congress for 2 years, and you were out for 2 years, and now you are back, and I am just glad to recognize you as one of the members of the freshman class.

But what we have been trying to do in this 104th Congress to make this place accountable to those working families that are way back on the West Coast of California and make some sense to the men and women, the moms and dads, that are trying to make it in this very hard economy.

So I just thank the gentleman for bringing up all the issues that you previously did, and I would just say that I guess we are going to have to tighten our seat belt because we are going to continue to see radical groups, big labor, especially the ones based here in Washington, such as the AFL-CIO, continuing to launch an assault on our efforts to bring about meaningful change in a way the Federal Government operates and undermine our efforts to secure a brighter future for the folks in California.

I think it is very obvious that at AFL-CIO they are not looking out for their union members and their families in our two districts. No; those Washington bosses, as far as I am concerned, are using those membership forced dues to fight against that balanced budget that would give them and the families such benefits as more take-home pay, and lower interest rates and the ability to decide how they are going to spend their dollars, and not a bureaucrat here in Washington, DC.

You know, I believe that the union members and the families in my district and yours, Mr. RIGGS, if they were given a choice, it is likely they would prefer their balanced budget bonus to a deceptive, dishonest, propaganda campaign against our voting record. And you know it is just amazing to see it transpire, and I would just say I guess

we were going to see this until November.

Mr. RIGGS. I think so, and I thank the gentleman for her comments.

Again, she is so right. She is basically describing the so-called medicare campaign that has been launched by big labor, the major Washington-based labor unions back here which have become the core constituency of the national Democratic Party, yet they are ignoring all the warning signs that we are heading towards bankruptcy, for one reason and one reason only: They want to use this as the political issue to regain control of the Congress.

Independent analysis indicates that you know Medicare is going broke. The gentleman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND] mentioned that we both been targeted by radio and television ads in our congressional districts, giving us an F for our votes on preserving Medicare from bankruptcy. That is actually out of the union press release. Yet if you look at the independent analysis that has been done of some of these advertisements by Brooks Jackson of CNN, he talks about the ads being a big hoax on the American people, grossly misleading.

One of the ads running now says the Democrats want to protect Medicare the Republicans want to gut it. But then Jackson goes on to admit Republicans currently propose to cut the growth of Medicare by \$168 billion over 7 years. President Clinton's budget calls for \$124 billion in cuts, which he calls savings.

He also analyzes another allegation in these ads. Republicans cut school lunches, cut Head Start, cut health care. Then Jackson, Brooks Jackson of CNN, calls this Democrat National Committee ad false advertising.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Congress appropriated more money for school lunches this year, just what President Clinton asked, in fact, and the Agriculture Department says it has increased the number of children served. Money from the Head Start preschool program has been cut 4 percent this year temporarily, but Republicans have agreed to a 1 percent increase once a permanent appropriations bill is passed. Meanwhile not a single child has been affected. In fact, Head Start enrollment is up this year.

On child health care, Republicans did pass a \$164 billion cut in Medicaid growth, which Clinton vetoed. Now differences have narrowed. Republicans last proposed to cut only \$85 billion over 7 years, again to save that program, which has been growing in an unsustainable rate, and President Clinton's own budget proposal cuts of \$59 billion.

As we saw in this ad, the Democrats' strategy is to, exact quote, Brooks Jackson on CNN, "not let the facts get in the way of a pro-Clinton political spin."

So again I thank the speaker for the time this evening. I will have more to say about these ads in the future. I would simply try to admonish her to advise the American people, you know, do not believe the lies and the scare tactics. Research the issues for yourself. Be informed, and I think you will see that we are trying to do the right thing, the responsible thing here in Congress, and we are trying to remember the old admonition of Mark Twain, which is, always do right, you will make some people happy and astonish the rest.

POSITIVE ECONOMIC AMERICANISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for too many Americans, the great American dream has been replaced by sleepless nights of worry. Worries about how to care for elderly parents, how to pay for a home, how to pay for a car, and how to pay for the children's college tuition, in a world where real wages have become stagnant, taxes are being raised, benefits are under assault, and jobs are being lost.

Second jobs often become the only job, because the main jobs have been lost to downsizing, or have been transferred elsewhere. That's what people are dreaming about. Their anxiety is real, not imagined.

American workers used to be in control of their own financial destinies. Hard work, loyalty, and ingenuity were rewarded and appreciated by American businesses. The result? Americans realized and lived the American dream, as generation after generation witnessed an increased standard of living. But younger generations do not believe they will have it better than their parents. For these days, hard work and loyalty are being rewarded with pink slips and unemployment checks.

Before Pat Buchanan enlightened America to the plight of the American worker, the issue of jobs and the state of the American economy was not a part of the political discussion. In the worlds of Democratic leader, RICHARD GEPHARDT, Pat "has, at the very least, recognized the crisis of falling wages and incomes. He has acknowledged what hard-working families go through to raise their children and put food on the table." And the New York Times stated that "until Patrick J. Buchanan made the issue part of the Presidential campaign, it seldom surfaced in political debate."

Pat pointed out the falling wages of the American worker. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, average hourly pay has fallen 11 percent since

1979. Why? Because of greedy corporations and the failed trade policy of the United States.

First, let me talk about the trade imbalance in America. For years I have been fighting to balance the playing field by introducing legislation to impose restrictions on imported steel and automobile. Not because foreign steel and cars are better than their American counterparts, but because foreign countries are restricting imports of American steel and cars. It is not fair to the American worker to allow foreign products to generously flow into this country without opening foreign markets to the same American products. And now the North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA], and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT], two deals I vociferously opposed, are only making things worse for Americans.

By Trade Representative Mickey Kantor's own figures, each \$1 billion in exports equals 20,000 jobs.

In 1995 the U.S. merchandise trade deficit was over \$175 billion. That means 3.5 million jobs were lost to foreign countries. And what is contributing to this deficit? NAFTA. In 2 years, we've gone from a trade surplus with Mexico of \$1.35 billion to a trade deficit of \$15.39 billion last year. In addition, in 1995 the United States trade deficit with Canada was also over \$15 billion. That is 600,000 jobs lost because of NAFTA.

Many of our own companies have in effect thrown up their hands in surrender to low-wage countries and decided to ship their operations abroad to take advantage of minuscule labor costs. In Indiana, the Whirlpool Corp. has announced it is moving 265 positions to a plant in Monterey, Mexico in order to strengthen the plant and improve job security. Aided by NAFTA, Whirlpool has improved job security to such a degree that over 5,000 jobs have been lost at its plant in Indiana in the course of the last 10 years.

But this is not a unique case. In my own district, General Motors has slowly but steadily been decommissioning its Electro-Motive plant for the last 10 to 15 years and sending the same work down to a subsidiary in Mexico.

But Mexican and Canadian workers aren't any better off than American workers, and neither is our environment. Because of NAFTA, American roads may soon open to Mexican trucks—trucks that often weigh more than double the 80,000 pound United States limit. These trucks are lax in safety standards, and with only 1 in 700 trucks being inspected at the border, American roads will be filled with mammoth, unsafe trucks carrying materials to points throughout the United States.

And not only is the American worker paying for these bad trade agreements in lost jobs and extra peril to the envi-

ronment, but a trade deficit also represents a liability on our national balance sheet—a loan that must be financed. If the trade deficit remains constant, by 2010 the United States will be paying the equivalent of 2.5 percent of our GDP in interest payments and capital outflows to foreign countries.

I agree with Pat Buchanan that global free trade should be judged by three simple rules: First, they maintain U.S. sovereignty; second, they protect vital American economic interests, and third, they ensure a rising standard of living for all American workers. It is clear that trade agreements like NAFTA and GATT are not following these rules and looking out for the welfare of working Americans, but are looking out for the interests of large multinational corporations whose sole loyalty is to the bottom line.

For too long, we have engaged in trade deals and foreign policy that serve foreign countries. The \$50 billion loan bailout to Mexico, which I opposed, only proves that NAFTA is a failure. And GATT, which often places the settlements of trade disputes in the hands of the World Trade Organization and representatives of small, Third World countries, compromises our sovereignty. Moreover, we rebuilt Europe and Japan after the Second World War—we still provide for their security—but it's time to use our powerful resources to rebuild the American dream and rebuild security for American families. Not just through Government programs—but through a partnership where Government can set fair and compassionate rules. Where Government can be an impartial referee, and where Government helps provide the tools.

That leads me to the plight of the American worker. In the 1980's, mostly young, male, blue-collar workers dominated layoffs. Wages of the principal breadwinner were declining and families were making up for that by sending more family members into the workplace, and they worked longer hours. By the end of the decade, families were running out of hours, with both parents working at several different jobs.

In 1988, I joined other colleagues in passing legislation that would prevent employers from blindsiding blue collar workers with sudden layoffs. This legislation, the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act, requires the employers to notify three bodies—workers, State dislocated worker units and local governments—of impending major mass layoffs, plant closings, or plant relocations. Unfortunately, while this legislation prepares American workers and communities for what lies ahead, it does not stop employers from firing workers en masse and causing sleepless nights of worry.

But now, white collar people with college degrees, a large number of

women included, are also being laid off, or downsized, as corporations like to call it. Large corporations account for many of the layoffs, and a large percentage of the jobs are lost to outsourcing—contracting out work to another company. While these outsourcing jobs contribute to the 8 million jobs that President Clinton claims have been added to the work force since 1992, these jobs are often with small companies that offer little benefits and low pay, and many are part-time positions with no benefits at all. Often, the laid off only get temporary work, tackling the tasks once performed by full timers. Even though I am happy that jobs have been created, the statistics don't show that these are part-time jobs that do not pay living wages. In fact, the country's largest employer is Manpower Inc., a temporary-help agency that rents out 767,000 workers a year.

A person who is dependent all of his life on low wages is a slave. This economic stagnation and loss of opportunity is sapping America of its boundless confidence and freedom. Clearly, the dignity of labor has been replaced by the slavery of insecurity. You can't do that to American workers and expect America to stay strong.

Often, in order to allay this insecurity, these low-paid or temporary workers try to join a union in hopes of raising pay or improving benefits. At a recent congressional hearing, a \$5.50 per hour employee of a small business with annual sales of over \$150 million testified that management told the employees that they would put a padlock on the door and move the business to another town if the employees formed a union. This is not an isolated case, for throughout the landscape of the American office, warehouse, and factory there are widespread fears of joining a union and expressing one's views.

The fear of job loss and anxiety about the future coupled with falling wages of Americans does not equate with America's economic figures. Profits of corporations are 50 percent higher than a decade ago, the gross domestic product is growing, and unemployment is lower. Then where is the money going? To fat cat corporations. The growing divide between Wall Street and mainstreet is causing a widening rift between the rich and the poor.

In 1974, U.S. CEO's were paid an average of 35 times the average worker. Today, that ratio has ballooned to 187 to 1. Comparably, in Germany that ratio is 21 to 1. In Japan the ratio is 16 to 1. There are great effects that result from the greed of these corporate CEO's. In 1979, the top 1 percent of earners in America held 22 percent of the wealth. Today, the top 1 percent hold 42 percent of the wealth. We even surpass Britain, long seen as the snooty example of a class structured society, in income disparity.

It is clear that multimillionaire CEO's are keeping more of the money for themselves. Workers once received compensation increases equal to 80 percent of productivity gains. Since 1979, workers have only received a 25-percent increase in compensation compared to their productivity gains. This is not fair, nor is it right. Workers who produce more and better products are being forced to labor longer for less compensation.

Furthermore, it is not secret that when a company announces a layoff that its stock soars. On the day of the announcement that 40,000 jobs would be cut, AT&T's stock when up 4 percent and Bob Allen, the CEO of AT&T, saw his stock increase by \$1.6 million, in that 1 day alone. The day Sears announced that 50,000 jobs would be downsized, its stock climbed 4 percent. When Xerox said it would trim 10,000 jobs, its stock surged 7 percent. The list goes on and on.

Fortunately, not all corporations view their employees in simple terms of stock market statistics. Anheuser-Busch, Malden Mills, Inland Copper, and United Technologies have all respected their workers and treated them like assets. For, instance, United Technologies reeducates its workers and gives stock incentives to employees who go back to school, no matter if the studies are related to United Technologies or not. This is the kind of social contract that is needed in America between corporations and its workers. Even financial forecasters have foreseen that companies which invest in their employees are better investments in the long term than companies that recklessly fire workers for the benefit of the quick buck.

But currently, Wall Street is not reacting well to the news of employment gains. When on March 8, the Labor Department announced that 705,000 workers had been added to payrolls, the Dow Jones industrial average fell 171 points. The next day's headline in the Washington Post screamed, "Job Gains Send Markets Plunging." There is no doubt that the shortsighted interests of Wall Street investors conflict with the long-term interests of working Americans. Less jobs, more profits, that is what Wall Street wants. As White House Press Secretary Mike McCurry said about the markets' response to job gains, "Sometimes there's a disconnect between Wall Street and Main Street." No, Mr. McCurry, not sometimes. It happens more often than we care to admit.

Sure, change and some turnover was inevitable as the American economy evolved past the industrial age. Technological innovations now allow a corporation to do more work with less manpower. But as of late, the economy has been driven by a policy that transformed labor markets. Incentives increased on Wall Street to break the so-

cial contracts between corporations and workers. Capitalism and greed ran rampant without regulations, injuring the working man and woman and losing sight of a vision for America's economic future. Yes, I do believe in capitalism, but I hold democracy and the welfare of the working men and women of this country in higher regard. While I respect the right of the individual, this society cannot be one that lives by the rule of survival of the fittest.

There are solutions to the plight of the American worker. We must change trade policies, modify corporate behavior, strengthen workers' rights, and provide for a more effective social safety net for the unemployed.

I also believe in free trade, because America has the most productive work force and best minds in the world. But most often, the countries that we trade with, do not have open markets and are not playing by the same rules that we hold to ourselves. They do not believe in free trade and therefore take advantage of America's willingness to play at a disadvantage. The time has come for a comprehensive U.S. trade policy that emphasizes reciprocity and stems America's hemorrhage of jobs and incomes. Future trade deals should not be made with foreign countries until they open their closed markets. Current trade agreements, such as NAFTA, should be amended or repealed unless certain conditions are met.

To this end, I am a member of a bipartisan coalition of Members in the House and Senate that have introduced the NAFTA Accountability Act. This act would incorporate a comprehensive set of benchmarks against which to measure NAFTA's promises in regard to trade balances, net job growth, democracy, reduction of illicit drug activity, crime, and increased public health standards. If any of the benchmarks of a prudent trade policy are not met, Congress would instruct the President to withdraw from NAFTA. The American people themselves are clamoring for legislation of this kind, as recent polls indicate that 52 percent of the public in March 1994 believed that NAFTA would help the job situation here. By November 1995, only 36 percent of the public still held that belief, while 55 percent of the people believed that NAFTA is causing jobs to go to foreign countries.

Changing bad trade deals goes hand in hand with changing corporate behavior, since these corporations are taking advantage of agreements by using cheap foreign labor while CEOs reap the profits. Moreover, multinational corporations often escape from paying U.S. income taxes while retaining the rights of citizenship. These tax loopholes must be closed, and corporations that receive tax breaks only to subsequently downsize should have their tax breaks eliminated.

But eliminating corporate tax loopholes will not solve the whole problem. I propose going one step further and creating tax rates that reward those corporations which create higher quality and better paying jobs in America. A new social contract should be adopted between the Government, the business community, and the working people of America. Tax rates would be reduced for corporations if they pay living wages for their workers, maintain or add jobs, give good benefits, and train or upgrade skills.

Corporate America is constantly clamoring for tax breaks, as the Republican Contract With America proposed to do. But tax breaks have been given in the past to these corporations only to see jobs go to foreign nations, the American work force downsized, CEO's reap huge profits, and the budget deficit balloon out of control. So let's give corporate America what they want: A tax break. But let's hold them accountable for the welfare of the American worker.

Corporate America is not the only entity that can help the middle class. Unions, as the vanguard of the workers, also have a role to play. They ensure a stable economy. To quote from Ray Abernathy of the AFL-CIO, "When organized labor and minimum wage laws were passed during the Depression, it wasn't only to prevent the exploitation of workers, it was also because big business understood the need to ensure the buying power of its customers."

That statement makes sense, because in modern economies, wealth is created when labor, capital, skills, and natural resources are continuously recycled as profits, wages, operating costs, taxes, or social welfare payments within the society that produced them. Unions, in effect, promote a healthy society by making sure that a fair percentage of the wealth is recycled in the form of wages. But distributing too much wealth as welfare undermines the work ethic, and distributing too much as profits to a relatively few top executives, as has been happening in America in the last two decades, concentrates wealth in the hands of a few.

Therefore, this has undermined support for the community and has led to a weakened public school system, unsafe streets, a declining morale, and an anxiety about the future across America.

At the very least, Government can ease the pain of down sized workers by passing health insurance reforms currently before Congress that allows those who lose their jobs to keep their health insurance. It is not fair, nor is it right, to have health and other social benefits for the very poor while Americans who have worked all their lives and contributed to the U.S. economy cannot have the same peace of mind. Mechanisms such as health insurance

portability need to be instituted so that working Americans will not have to spend all of their savings on health care bills and subsequently fall to a level of poverty where the only means of living is provided for by the Government. But this is just a minimal step. Much more can and should be done to ease the real anxiety and worries that Americans are now feeling.

We must all work together to not only reinforce America's place in the global economy, but to return the American worker and the American family to a prosperous place in society. Then we can progress on our course at the greatest industrial democracy in the world.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I have presented the problem and a few potential solutions to the economic quandary America faces. But I would like everyone within the sound of my voice to send me their solutions. And in a few weeks I will present those solutions and give a vision of what America can be.

□ 2030

A VICTORY FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to come to the floor tonight to essentially say that in my judgment, the American people have won a victory in the negotiations between the Republican House and Senate and the President of the United States. In fact, I want to just take a moment to congratulate the Republican Members of this Congress who decided early on that we wanted to have a comprehensive program to balance the budget and give Americans some of their hard-earned money back, reversing the tax increase that the President imposed in 1993.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, there have been intense negotiations going on in the area of discretionary spending. Discretionary spending is the kind of spending we must approve on a year-to-year basis, the only spending that the Congress actually must vote on.

As we are all aware in this body, there has been a debate going on in terms of the level of discretionary spending, or the spending we approve each and every year. That is separate from the spending known as entitlements, where if Congress did not even show up, spending would go up automatically.

When the President vetoed our balanced budget bill, he killed all efforts to reform and return the entitlement programs back to the communities and towns all across this country, where

Americans could begin to design local solutions to local problems and save money, so that we can save the next generation and end the problem of stagnant wages and begin to solve the problems of job insecurity.

The entitlement side of this is something that we have not yet been able to lasso in, because the President is opposed to returning these entitlement programs to the American people, so that we can design them using local solutions to local problems at lesser costs.

But the one area where the President was forced to sit down and negotiate with us in order to keep the Government of the United States on its day-to-day efforts at being run, was the appropriations process, that spending we must approve each and every year.

In the announcement that is currently being made, it is very, very clear that the Republicans had won a tremendous victory from the standpoint that we will have the most dramatic change in that discretionary or year-to-year spending that we must approve since World War II. The people of this country should know that the Republican budget set spending limits, and we said that we wanted to reduce Washington spending.

As everybody knows, this has been an ongoing debate between us and the administration, and I am here tonight to make the case, the clear case, that saving \$23 billion in spending in the fiscal year 1996 appropriation bill is historic; that in fact our children will look back upon the passage of this bill as a significant step forward towards balancing the Federal budget and bringing real change to this city. In a nutshell, Mr. Speaker, the \$23 billion is, frankly, again, the most significant change that we have seen in this city since World War II.

In fact, many people said, "What have the Republicans gotten from their revolution? Have the Republicans really been able to achieve anything?"

I would argue that after only 17 months of holding office, we have been able to deliver and will deliver here tomorrow, a bill that will allow us to go forward, save \$23 billion, and make that giant first payment, that giant first down payment on guaranteeing that we will get to a balanced budget, that we will empower Americans, that we will give them some of their own tax dollars back so they can spend money on their children.

Now, we went through a whole variety of programs that are actually eliminated. Mr. Speaker, tonight I can show you at least four pages of programs that have been excised, eliminated, cut, and we hope ultimately to take some of the dollars we saved in these programs and give these dollars back to the American people in some tax relief, after all, it is their money, and/or apply some of this money to

saving the next generation or some of this money to balancing the budget so we can bring about lower interest rates.

Now, could we have done better? We sure could have. There are a number of programs here that the Congress of the United States will continue to fund, and programs that the Congress of the United States does not want to fund. Let me talk about one of them, the Goals 2000 program. That is a program that is being run in this city to try to tell our mothers and fathers across this country how our children are doing at learning.

Frankly, I do not think that the mothers and fathers that I know who have children in school across this country need to call the Department of Education to ask a bureaucrat, who does not even know what time zone they live in, whether their children are learning or not. But yet the Goals 2000 program that keeps power in this city, in the hands of bureaucrats, and denies the full determination of whether children are learning, denies mothers and fathers the opportunity to solely decide whether their children are learning, has been denied to them.

I will tell you that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, whenever he has somebody that wants to be part of this revolution to downsize government, will put mothers and fathers back in charge of evaluating how their children are doing in school. But we have a President, an administration, that has fought day after day after day for higher Washington spending and more control by Federal bureaucrats.

But we do not just want to focus on what we did not accomplish, because, frankly, what we have accomplished will be that one underlying sentence in modern history that will say that the Republican Congress was able to stand tall and was able to put the children of this country and the mothers and fathers who are worried about their economic future today first.

This bill that we will bring up tomorrow will represent the most significant change in the day-to-day spending habits of the Government of the United States since World War II.

I now would like to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], who has done an outstanding job on this bill. It has been a pleasure for me to be able to work with him as the chairman of the Committee on the Budget. We have had a great and growing friendship and great and growing respect for the job each of us is trying to do. I would like him to talk about how proud he is of the kind of change that this Republican Congress in just a short 17 months has been able to deliver. I will suggest that you ain't seen nothing yet.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I thank my friend, the distinguished chairman of the Com-

mittee on the Budget, for yielding to me. I want to compliment him on articulating the agenda of this Republican Congress, the 104th Congress, which in fact is keeping its promise that it made to the American people when we ran.

□ 2045

We told them, Mr. Speaker, we wanted to reduce the cost of Government. We wanted to get our hands out of the pockets of the taxpayers so that the American family would have more money to spend on the welfare of their own children, on the education of their children, and that we would reduce the role of Government in the way of cutting back on the numbers of programs, on agencies and on departments. And we have done just that.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget has provided a road map for all of Congress to follow, along with the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget, Senator DOMENICI. The two of them have worked hand in glove together to put this country on a firm and financially sound footing.

And from our standpoint in the Committee on Appropriations, we have tried to accept their guidelines gladly and comply with their guidelines so that we have, indeed, been able to reap great savings to the American taxpayer.

Frankly, that is where we are, Mr. Speaker. Through this great effort, we can now say with great pride that 6 months ago the political and economic gurus were predicting that in fiscal year 1996 we would be faced with a \$200 billion deficit for this year. And what do we hear now? It is now \$144 billion for fiscal year 1996, the same fiscal year. In other words, we are coming in at \$54 billion lower than we were expected to come in only 6 months ago.

I think that is largely due to the great work of the Committee on the Budget, working in tandem with all of the other committees in Congress to comply with their guidelines, as well as our own accomplishments.

On the Committee on Appropriations, we only have jurisdiction over one-third of the Federal spending in a single year, but in fiscal year 1995, since we took office, we were able to reap \$20 billion of savings under what would have been otherwise spent; and this year, with the completed package that is now being finalized back in the back rooms of Congress and will be voted on tomorrow by, hopefully, a majority of the Members of the House and a majority of the Members of the Senate, so we can hopefully send the bill over to the President for his signature, we find that we are going to reap another "another" \$23 billion in savings over and above the \$20 billion in savings that we got in fiscal year 1995, for a net total of savings in the discretionary budget of

some \$43 billion under what would have been spent had the Republicans not taken control of Congress on January 1, 1995.

So I think when the dust is settled, and as the gentleman has pointed out, this is the greatest amount of savings since World War II, and when the dust is settled, when our children and our grandchildren sit there and thumb through the history books and say what was accomplished in that 104th Congress, they will totally disregard or totally not understand that some people had quarrels with the spending on one program, other people had quarrels with spending on another program, but what they will see are those bottom line figures.

For the first time in modern contemporary history, instead of spending more on discretionary spending, instead of finding new programs, instead of finding new agencies, instead of finding new departments and spending what we spent last year plus an inflation kicker on all of them, for the first time we have cut the number of programs, well over 200 programs in fiscal year 1996. We have eliminated agencies, we have cut down on the duplication and waste, and since January 1, 1995, we have saved the American taxpayer \$43 billion.

That is not chicken feed. That is real savings to the taxpayer, and it shows the conclusion that the average vote had come to over the last 10 years, that there was no hope for turning back the ever-increasing cost and growth of Government, is false. It is simply not true. We are scaling back the cost of Government.

And if the President would start complying with his promises to reform welfare as we know it, to fix the Medicare system, as his own commissioners say must be done, to acknowledge the fact that many of our States today are in trouble on Medicaid, as we speak, and to know that with respect to Social Security, if you ask a large group of people under the age of 35, a majority of them think they are more likely to see a UFO, an unidentified flying object, than they are to collect on Social Security program, and you add that together, if we get the President to face up to those very real problems, we can do exactly what the chairman of the Committee on the Budget has accomplished in pushing through the House of Representatives along with his counterpart in the Senate, we can balance this budget by the year 2002.

We can do it. We all know that we can do it because we have got a floor plan that has been promoted and proposed and drawn up by the distinguished chairman and it can be done. All we need is the political will in the White House to do it.

Mr. KASICH. Let me just ask the chairman, if he would, let us just put this in terms that Americans can understand, so when they are going to

work tomorrow they can turn to the person next to them and say, you know, we thought the Republicans were not getting anywhere, but did you hear that they were able to cut the Washington spending and the waste and the abuse, and they were actually able to save us \$23 billion this year.

Is that right, I ask the chairman of the committee? Is there anything more complicated than that?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No more complicated, and just a little bit better when one considers that 200 programs, each with its own good intent, but each with its overlapping and duplicative bureaucracy, ceases to exist with the signature of the President on this bill.

So 200 programs are no longer in existence, \$23 billion is saved for the American taxpayer, and the cost of Government is no longer rising, it is falling.

Mr. KASICH. And what was the greatest obstacle, Mr. Chairman, that you faced in being able to accomplish this job of saving us this money?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Well, quite frankly, the obstacles did not arise in the House or in the Senate, the obstacles arose and emanated there from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. Because if we had had the cooperation of those good folks, it would not have taken us a year and a quarter to complete this process.

Mr. KASICH. So, in other words, even though the President talks about his wanting to, well, he declares the era of big Government being over, he fought for virtually every dime of Washington spending that ends up in the hands of the Federal bureaucrats. He fought for this, and you fought against him, and this House and Senate stood tall and we actually were able to save the most significant amount of money for our children that we have since World War II; is that correct?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is correct. And in fairness to the negotiators who participated on behalf of the White House, the fact is that they did negotiate, we have a package, and I do hope that the President will sign that package. I have every reason to believe that he will. Had they been more obstinate, I suppose it might have been impossible to reach an agreement. But I am delighted an agreement has been reached.

And one thing I will say, from the very beginning, we never deviated from the ground rules. The Committee on the Budget gave us our instructions: Stay within your budget allocations, make sure that you save the American people that \$23 billion. If you have to raise money for the President on some programs, take it out of that discretionary pot and make sure that you cut other programs. And that is what we did. We took the chairman's admonition to stay within our budget caps. We stayed within them, and the American

people are \$23 billion richer in that they have not spent another \$23 billion that they would have spent had we not done what we set out to do.

Mr. KASICH. Of course, again, what the people need to understand is this is really the only spending that the Congress of the United States was forced to approve in cooperation with the President. Is that correct? This is the only spending where, if we didn't come to work, Government would shut down; is that correct?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is correct. And as we all remember, when this House passed an Interior bill, a Commerce, State, Justice bill, and one other appropriations bill before Christmas, the President vetoed all three of those bills and, in fact, the government did shut down.

Likewise, when the Senate did not pass the Labor, Health and Human Services bill, frankly, that was in jeopardy of closing the government.

But we tried that. That was done on all sides, and, frankly, nobody felt they came out the better for it. We had to go back to the table. But we couldn't override the President's vetoes and we were left with no choice. So the idea was to negotiate with the President and still reach those budget caps. We did that and we have those savings.

Mr. KASICH. But we had to drag them kicking and screaming all the way to the water bucket and force them to drink, did we not?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The President wanted much more spending.

Mr. KASICH. Let me just say, though, and I do not want to give just a civic lesson this morning, but for our colleagues who are watching this special order, our own colleagues, the discretionary spending, this year-to-year spending that we must approve in order to keep government working, is only one-third of the budget. The other two-thirds of the budget is interest on the national debt and the entitlement programs.

Now, if BOB LIVINGSTON and JOHN KASICH and CHRISTOPHER SHAYS and PETER TORKILDSEN would not even come to Washington, along with the rest of the Congress, that spending goes up automatically; is that correct?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Automatically.

Mr. KASICH. Two-thirds of the budget is on automatic pilot going through the roof, threatening the future of our children, threatening economic security for every American today, and denying the American people a right to run their own programs with their own money, using their own judgments in their own communities.

We cannot force the President to sign a bill to give us those reforms, can we?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Absolutely not. And I would point out to the gentleman, as he well knows, that the formula around here in Congress in the old days was very simple: We spent

that much on that many programs. We need more programs, we will create several new programs, and we will throw in an inflation kicker, and for good will we will throw in a few more dollars on top of that.

So we were always spending more and more and more and more money. And then, all of a sudden, something funny happened on the way to the polls, Republicans took control of the House and the Senate and we have reversed that trend. We are now spending less and less. \$20 billion of savings in fiscal year 1995 and \$23 billion in 1996.

Mr. KASICH. It is just a shame that we cannot get or enter into with him the process that forces us to reform those entitlements, is it not?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Well, if the President had signed the bill that you, Mr. Chairman, pushed through this Congress, frankly, we would be well on our way to a balanced budget by the year 2002. The fact he vetoes it makes me very, very frightened when I look at that chart that I have been showing around recently that shows that big red portion representing interest on the debt, which is so large that within a year or so it is going to exceed what we spend on the defense of this Nation.

We will spend more money just paying off the interest on our borrowings of past years than we will spend on the defense of this Nation. That is a frightening thought. And if that trend continues, our children will either have to pay extraordinary taxes to have the benefits at all and still will probably have to pay high taxes.

Mr. KASICH. But I would say to the gentleman, that staying within the blueprint that the Republicans laid out, you have achieved a major piece of that. If we were to achieve the other pieces of that blueprint, we would not only be able to balance the budget in the conventional terms in which we define it, we would also return an awful lot of power and money and influence to the American people and all the cities and towns across this country. We would guarantee a bright light at the end of this tunnel for our children so that they will have a beautiful American legacy, we would be able to give tax relief.

And, you know, in 1993 we raised taxes. The President says he raised them too much. What we are trying to do is cancel out those tax increases, frankly. And if we could just get the rest of this job done the right way, we would make for a better America, wouldn't we?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. So much so that we would also get the government out of competition for American dollars. We would cease to borrow money. And if we could cease to borrow money, that means interest rates would come down, and by Alan Greenspan's estimates, the chairman of the Federal Reserve, come down as much as two full

percentage points, which means two points off the cost of your mortgage on your house; two points off the loan you use to send your kids to college; and two points off the loan you used to buy your car.

□ 2100

Significant savings to the American people, if only the Government would stop borrowing in order to conduct its business year after year.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman if he would stay for just a few more minutes. I would like to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], a member of the Committee on the Budget who has felt passionately about the need to attack these problems.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, as I was hearing both of the gentlemen, both chairmen of this new Republican majority, I just kind of stood in awe thinking of the fact that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] was the fifth ranking Member of the Committee on Appropriations. This new Republican majority said that we wanted the best and the brightest to take these positions. They were given that assignment. I was thinking what a thankless task it has been for them.

There is not a Member that has not been disappointed with certain parts of the hard decisions that they have had to make. I just wanted to come personally and thank my colleague for the extraordinary job he has done as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the chairman who has actually had to make cuts in budgets.

We slowed the growth of Medicare and Medicaid but we still allow them to grow significantly. But you actually said, we are going to spend less dollars next year than the year we are in. And you are doing exactly what we intended to do. We wanted to get our financial house in order and balance our Federal budget. We want to save our trust funds for future generations. And most importantly, we want to transform this social and corporate welfare state, this caretaking society into a caring opportunity society. And I just wanted to thank you for the work you are doing and to celebrate the fact that it has been a long and arduous journey, but you have done it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I just know that he is one of the foremost among us in this House and empathizes with the hardship that the American family faces every day. Whether it is a two-parent family or a one-parent family who is struggling to raise his or her or their children, in this environment they have got to work maybe more than one job a day and they are struggling.

When the Government takes, continues to take that bite out of their pocketbooks and send the money to Wash-

ington because they say that Washington can spend their money better, those folks intuitively know that that is not true. They know that they have to balance their books, and they know that, if their expenses exceed their income, that they are going to run into financial trouble and possibly even legal trouble. Those people that run small businesses and large businesses as well know that at the end of the year they have got to balance their books or at the end of the month they have got to balance their books. Their income has to match their outflow.

Mr. Speaker, they just cannot understand that since World War II, the American people, the U.S. Congress has only balanced its books, I think, three times, three times. Otherwise we have been spending more than we receive, and we borrow the difference and just say, well, let our children pay the bill.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that it is in my judgment even more than about just adding up this column with this column. Frankly, Americans for a significant period of time now believe that their hard-earned tax dollars are going to programs that do not make sense, programs in this city, run by people addicted to Washington spending, who do not do it with a sign above their desk that says, this is not your money.

In other words, the American people believe the people in this city are not good stewards of their hard-earned pay. They are sick and tired of sending money, power and influence to this city, a city that has been proceeding on a course that is bankrupting this country and at the same time not solving the problems that we have.

Do my colleagues know what I think Americans are saying? Let me do it. Let me keep my money in my community. Let me have my influence back. Let me have control of my neighborhood.

Mr. Bureaucrat in Washington, I do not really need you in my neighborhood. Frankly, I wish you would just stay in Washington and let me run my own neighborhood.

What you have delivered to us, Mr. Chairman, is a new process. You have given us a new paradigm. That new paradigm is that this city counts less and people out across this countryside count more. This is a response to what the American people have wanted in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I will suggest that, if we had not stood on principle, if we had not made the fight that we have made, we would have lost this. It would have been business as usual. Did we get everything we wanted? Of course not, because we have a crowd downtown that does not want to put people back in charge of their neighborhoods. But we are going to fight for it. We are going to fight for it on this. We are going to fight for it on welfare. We are going to

fight for it to give our senior citizens choice on Medicare. We are going to give people their tax dollars back. And we are going to save not only the future for our children, but we are going to guarantee economic security today for the American family. You cannot have it with runaway Washington spending and debt and bureaucracy and standing in line.

This does not get it all done, but that sure delivers a very strong message and accomplishes a great deal. And you, sir, should be very proud of what you and your committee were able to achieve.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we could not have done it without the cooperation of both the gentlemen who have addressed me.

I just want to say that the appropriations process for the 104th Congress is a three-act play. Fiscal year 1995 was act one. We saved \$20 billion. Fiscal year 1996 is, and we are drawing to a closure, is almost to an end, and we are saving \$23 billion. And we go next week to fiscal year 1997. With the help of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget and the gentleman from Connecticut and all of our other colleagues, I think we are going to have as much to crow about at the end of fiscal year 1997 or more than we do today.

ON THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the gentlemen of the Budget and the Appropriations Committees ended so abruptly. I was about to ask a few questions and have them address those questions. They are still in the Chamber so I will go ahead and ask the questions. Maybe they will give me the answers later.

In the process of revamping the budget, do they realize that—they realize above all that money comes into Washington and then flows out. Why does Louisiana, why does Louisiana get so much more money from the Federal Government than it pays into the Federal Government? The gentleman who heads the Committee on Appropriations is from the State of Louisiana, and Louisiana gets \$6.4 billion more from the Federal Government than it pays into the Federal Government.

You can downgrade Washington and talk about Washington spending money, but Washington does not spend money in Washington. The Federal Government is merely a transit, an exchange. They pull in the money and they appropriate it out as it is needed for various functions, and it flows into the States across the union. There have been studies done that I have

quoted here on this floor on several occasions about how much each State pays into the Federal Government and how much each State gets back.

Among the high roller States, the States that get more back from the Federal Government than they pay into the Federal Government, is Louisiana. Louisiana gets \$6.4 billion more from the Federal Government. These are the 1994 figures, the only year the complete figures are available for. And these figures come from a study done by the Kennedy School of Government, a very thorough study which looks at all of the Federal expenditures for military installations, the salaries of servicemen, the various military related functions that are carried out by the States, as well as programs like food stamps and Medicaid. It is all totaled up.

Louisiana is a big gainer. After this great revamping of the budget and revamping of the appropriations process, where they have saved so much money, will Louisiana be paying more of its fair share. Will Louisiana shoulder its own burden? New York, on the other hand, my State, pays \$18.9 billion more into the Federal Government than it gets back from the Government. New York, New York.

I heard Mr. KASICH, the head of the Committee on the Budget, say that we do not need Government telling us what to do. Our neighborhoods should decide; our neighborhoods should be left alone. The neighborhoods of New York would like to have that \$18.9 billion back and we could divide it up and take care of our own problems, but we are paying it into the Federal Government and not getting back an equal value.

In fact, we are the State of the Union at the very top of the list of the States that pay more than they get back. California is the largest State in the union. But whereas New York, in 1994, paid \$18.9 billion into the Federal Government more than it got back, California only paid \$2 billion more to the Federal Government than it got back.

California has had earthquakes and mud slides and large amounts of Federal money have gone to California in order to relieve those problems, but over the past 4 or 5 years, California has steadily paid less into the Federal Government than New York, although California is the largest State.

Mr. KASICH comes from Ohio, and Mr. SHAYS, who joined them at the last minute, he is from Connecticut. Ohio and Connecticut, like New York, are donor States. We pay more into the Federal Government than we get back from the Federal Government.

My great question is, after all of these changes are made, after they have cut the school lunch programs, after they have downsized and cut the housing programs, after they have gone after the Medicaid program, the Aid to

Families with Dependent Children program, after food stamps have been cut, after they have made all these cuts of relatively small programs, they have not cut defense very much. In fact, these same gentlemen who stood here before us and talked about a revolution in the budget and appropriations making process did not cut defense. They increased defense by \$6 billion. At a time when the Soviet Union no longer exists and the threat to America is less than ever before, we have an increase of \$6 billion.

The President did not want 46 billion more for defense. The President did not want a B-2 bomber. The President did not want extra money for certain kinds of programs that were beneficial to members of the Committee on Appropriations and members of the Committee on the Budget for their States.

We have a lot of waste in the defense budget, and these gentleman did not attack that at all. So I think it is very important to what I have to say today to recognize the fact that there is an America, this is a particular era in America where we have 2 basic approaches being taken, maybe 2 mentalities being shown. One is a big shot mentality which says that the rich and powerful can do no wrong, the rich and powerful should be allowed to waste money on a wholesale basis, because when you increase the defense budget by \$6 billion, it is already above \$200 billion, what are you doing? You are increasing the amount of money available to go into the payment for manufactured weapons and for supplies and for various items that are bought from huge corporations. And the corporations are owned by people who have stock on Wall Street. So you are feeding the richest people in America. They have their hooks into the defense, the military industrial complex.

So every dollar that goes for defense is a dollar you know is going to help rich people get richer, to help powerful people get more powerful, because there is a relationship between dollars and power. Those programs are not being cut, only the cuts for the people at the very bottom.

There was a hearing today in the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, a markup at the subcommittee level dealing with a program for people with disabilities, the IDEA, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. This is providing education for children in America who have probably the greatest needs. Extra money has to be spent to educate these children because of the fact that they have great needs. They have problems, learning disabilities, physical disabilities. And the amount of money that the Federal Government contributes to this program is very small. It is 7 percent of the total. States and local governments contribute more, most of the money.

Nevertheless, the committee is chipping away at the small amount of money being spend on children with disabilities all across America. They are chipping away at the programs. A great deal of time and energy has gone into nitpicking about this costs too much for attorney's fees, it costs too much to run a parents program where the parents have an opportunity to get educated about what the program is all about and they can, they are empowered to work with the schools in order to get a better education for their children, all these things suddenly cost too much.

These are programs for little people. These are programs for ordinary Americans, we the people. We the people do not seem to count very much. We the people are always the object of intense scrutiny. The microscope of the Committee on Appropriations, the microscope of the Committee on the Budget is focused on these little programs that have very small amounts of money, and they are trimming away at these little programs in order to save America from going bankrupt.

□ 2115

It is rank hypocrisy, rank hypocrisy. These same committees, the great Committee on Appropriations, the great Committee on the Budget, are not concerned at all about facts that are introduced by other entities. You know we do not find out here in Congress; other people have to tell us.

The General Accounting Office tells us the CIA has \$2 billion, at least, in money that it did not spend over the years and it had lying around in the petty cash fund. The CIA has that kind of money lying around.

An audit revealed that they had \$2 billion, \$2 billion that the director of the CIA did not know about, \$2 billion that the President did not know about.

Two billion dollars is a lot of money; ask these gentleman here. You know, \$2 billion, we can stop the cuts in the school lunch programs with \$2 billion for more than a year. Two billion dollars would mean that we could fund the title I programs for schools, provide money, the only money we provide, to elementary secondary education school, education. I mean most of the money comes out of the title I program. A \$7 billion program, and they were proposing earlier in the year to cut it by \$1.1 billion.

But \$2 billion for the CIA could have ended that cut for 2 years. They were going to cut it by \$1.1 billion per year. So that meant that in 2 years it would have been \$2.2 billion. Take the money that the CIA has laying around, waste it, and you could end the cut, most of the cut, on title I.

The Federal Reserve Board, another big-shot agency, an agency where big shots, the rich and the powerful, run the agency. The rich and the powerful

have money lying around to the tune of \$3.7 billion. The General Accounting Office found that the Federal Reserve has \$3.7 billion lying around that it has not used. They call it their Rainy Day Fund.

In 79 years, in the last 79 years, the Federal Reserve has never needed to use that Rainy Day Fund. They have never had any losses, never had any crisis or problems in 79 years. So why do they need to have \$3.7 billion lying around? How much interests would you get on \$3.7 billion to offset the payments on the deficit? If that \$3.7 billion had been given to the Treasury, where it belongs, we would not have a situation where you pay interest on \$3.7 billion worth of debt. You would have that much less to pay.

Combine the \$3.7 billion in the Federal Reserve slush fund with the \$2 billion in the CIA slush fund, and they have large amounts of money that could be appropriated for education.

Gentleman stood there and they talked about how proud they were that they made cuts in the education program. They were not just talking about cuts. But one of them said we, we, want the parents of America to know that we have stopped the Federal Government from telling them what to do by cutting out the Goals 2000 program.

Well, there are several things wrong with that statement. The gentleman is assuming that the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget have all knowledge. The Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, of course, authorized the legislation which contains Goals 2000. The Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities authorized the legislation which contains Opportunity To Learn standards.

I serve on the Education Committee. I know the process. We debated for 6 months the Opportunity To Learn standards. We debated for 3 months the Goals 2000 general program. We debated for another 2 months with the Senate. And the back and forth in the Senate conference and the House conference went on for 2 months on the Opportunity To Learn standards alone.

With all this deliberation and all of this marshaling of facts, hearing testimony that the authorizing committees went through in the Senate and the House, along come the lords of the appropriation committee, and they are in the appropriation process going to tell us it is no good. They have all the knowledge, they have all the wisdom, it is no good. The implication is that we should just abolish all of the other committees of Congress. You know, we do not need a Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. We do not need that. We do not need other committees if the Committee on Appropriations, after its large-scale deliberation on numerous topics and numerous programs, is going to come to the

conclusion that they can wipe out a program in the appropriations process.

We all know that that is against the rules. We all know that the Committee on Appropriations has no authority to wipe out a program like Goals 2000, like Opportunity To Learn standards, and yet we have seen again and again on the floor of the House when we challenge the Appropriations Committee, we say you have violated the rules. They said, yes, we violated the rules; you do not like it, appeal to the Chair. And, of course, they have the numbers to vote down every appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

You know, every attempt to get the Chair to enforce the rules is frustrated by the fact that they have the numbers and they use those numbers. You know if we were in another arena, it would be illegal to use the numbers to do illegal things. Of course, the House rules are the House rules. You violate the House rules, and there is no punishment. We cannot put a committee in the little jail cells we have down in the Capitol. In this Capitol we still have from the old days, had some jail cells that they used to keep to put rowdy staff members and Congressmen. We do not use that any more. So when the Committee on Appropriations violates the rules, there is no enforcement mechanism, and the majority vote can always back up the Committee on Appropriations.

So what we are talking about tonight is America, does America exist for the rich and the powerful only, is there an America where we the people are still in charge, is there an America where we the people matter?

We the people have a little program helping children with disabilities. You know, does it cost \$2 billion? No, it does not even cost \$200 million. Tiny program, helping children with disabilities, a program that was supposed to deal with rural communities where children with disabilities were totally out of touch with the program, urban communities where poor people were out of touch and they were not being served, they were not participating. That tiny program was singled out today in the process of the markup of the subcommittee and wiped out, does not exist any more if that markup goes through.

They also cut other provisions.

They also implied that the commitment of the Federal Government for children with disabilities is too great. You know, in this great, rich country where we can afford to have a Federal Reserve keep a slush fund of \$3.7 billion and the CIA have \$2 billion lying around, we cannot afford to take care of the needs of children with serious disabilities.

Is America for the rich and powerful only? Are we a Nation of big shots versus ordinary, everyday people where the big shots walk away with everything, nothing is too good for them,

anything is too much for ordinary people?

That is the way the Republican majority in this Congress has proceeded. The omnibus bill that they are bragging about and crowing about is a bill which has gone after little people, a bill that is focused on the small programs.

They also implied the big shots can never waste too much, big shots should never be chastised. They do not make speeches about the Federal Reserve Board having \$3.67 billion lying around. They do not make speeches about the CIA having \$2 billion lying around.

It is worse than that, of course. There is a much worse problem that we have to deal with.

A friend of mine, my colleague from New York State, CAROLYN MALONEY, has done a study of all the debt that is owed to various Federal agencies, debt that is owed that is uncollected.

Now, here we are cutting school lunch programs, here we are going after the Medicaid Program, a program for health care for poor children, a program that takes care of nursing home people, poor and cannot afford to pay for nursing homes. Here we are going after programs that are vitally needed by people who are in great, and we are not paying attention to the fact that \$55 billion, according to the study done by my colleague, CAROLYN MALONEY, Congresswoman MALONEY, on the Government Oversight Committee has done, a study which is fantastic, and she really should be commended for the great work she has done in this area. She has pinpointed, and she has documented, and I have the charts here. She goes agency by agency and shows, according to the last data that was available, and things might have gotten worse since then, the last data that is available, what is owed in the Farmers' Home Loan Mortgage and other programs in the Department of Agriculture, one of the major offenders. Large amounts of money are owed in the farm programs. The Farmers' Home Loan Mortgage Program is the worst offender. Large amounts of money, debts have been forgiven, forgiven in the Farmers' Home Loan Mortgage Program.

I cannot find out yet what is the criteria for forgiving someone who owes a debt to the Federal Government. Who makes those decisions? From my poor constituents in Brownsville, and East New York, Crown Heights, back in Brooklyn, I am sure they would like to know who is the person you see that forgives debts when they are owed to the Federal Government.

There are people out there who owe a few thousand dollars to the IRS, and they are being continually pursued. There some people, a head of small programs, programs that have funds, and they did not quite know how to handle the bookkeeping. So they were in a situation where the grant funding came

late from the State, and they needed supplies, and they needed various things, and they spent the money that they should have been each quarter sending to the IRS. IRS now wants its money. So it is some of the programs have gone out of business, so they are going after the homes of the members of the board of directors, these little people who came out to help make these programs work. They did not get paid; they were just members on the board. They must now have their homes jeopardized because the IRS wants to let unpaid taxes from that agency.

And yet talking about a few thousand dollars here. You know, you are not talking \$1 million, not talking about a \$100,000. Talking about a few thousand dollars that they are being pursued for. But in the Farmers' Home Loan Mortgage forgave over a 5-year period \$11 billion, \$11 billion they forgave.

How does that happen? I have asked questions for the last 2 years and tried to get answers as how do you go about forgiving that kind of debt? But in the Department of Agriculture somebody has the power to forgive.

On occasion we had the Department of Agriculture representatives before us in the Committee on Government Oversight, and we asked basic questions like how does it happen that people get so delinquent in the payment of these mortgage loans? You know. My mortgage is not paid in 1 month, you know I get a big penalty, and I get a notice second month that they are ready to start foreclosing procedures. How do millions of dollars accumulate for farmers home loan mortgage situation?

I was told by the man standing there who was a high ranking official that, you know, sometimes the addresses change, people move, and you just cannot find them when their addresses change. Now I do not know how anybody with a mortgage on a piece of property can have his address change so radically that you cannot find him. The property is still there, they still own it. How can you sit before a committee of Congress and give an answer like that, that we have a hard time finding people because their addresses change?

But it was done, you know, and I am not one of these guys who bashes the Federal Government and the bureaucracy, but that was a low point in the Federal bureaucracy when they give that kind of answer. Of course State bureaucracies, city bureaucracies, are just as bad. We heard all the discussion here about how terrible it is that money flows into Washington and it is not spend properly. Washington, you know is not alone. Probably Washington does a better job. Its bureaus and bureaucracy does a better job than most State governments and most municipal governments.

The spotlight of course is on Washington. One of the greatest things about the Federal Government is that it is always a gold fish bowl because there is the national media, and there are all kinds of people who are watching critically, but at the State and city level there are terrible things that happen in silence. Nobody says anything. A lot of terrible things happen, and it is not hidden, but everybody seems to be paralyzed.

In New York City, the mayor of New York City who prides himself on reestablishing efficient government, who has a deputy mayor who comes out of business, and he is always pounding away at expenditures by little people and little agencies driving the welfare rolls down by making a long application and requiring people who are hungry to wait 2 or 3 months before they can ever be interviewed.

□ 2130

There are all kinds of ways they use to oppress the little people at the bottom. On the other hand, they let out a contract to an agency for \$43 million. The City of New York, the Giuliani administration, they put out a contract for \$43 million to an agency and the board of directors of the agency never saw the contract. The chairman of the board said he never saw the contract. A staff member of the agency negotiated the contract and signed the contract.

Of course it was later discovered that people in the agency that let the contract, negotiated the contract at the city level, they had some of them go and get jobs. They got jobs at the agency with which they had negotiated, so it is obvious that something more than mismanagement was going on here. We had mismanagement and corruption.

We have not heard of a single person being arrested as a result of this \$43 million contract. Oh, yes, they took back the contract, they canceled the contract, closed down the agency, a lot of furor about "This cannot be," but no real answer as to why or how does an agency have a staff member negotiate a contract for \$43 million.

I do not think you would have that happen in the Federal Government. Whatever things that you might find wrong, you will not have that kind of blatant violation of ordinary sophomoric rules of contracting, but it happens often at the level of municipal government. It happens often at the level of State government.

In our State, we have a governor who openly is saying he is going to move the functions of government around the State and place those agencies that employ large numbers of people in the areas where he got the most votes. It is no secret. It is all out there. How can a State allow the functions of government or the agencies of government, the resources of government, to be used for partisan purposes? But big shots seem to be able to do this.

In America now where the big shots can walk away, do anything they want, they owe the Federal Government millions of dollars. When the Farmers Home Loan Mortgage story was first broken, the Washington Post had a front page story and they talked about 5 millionaires who were perpetrators, who were guilty, 5 millionaires. One of them was sitting on a board appointed by President Reagan that made decisions about who got to keep and who got additional loans.

Five millionaires. I do not know of a single millionaire that was arrested, has been tried or convicted of anything, among those millionaires who were cited. They were named. The Washington Post named them. Four or five. At least four, who were named. Yet the rich and powerful were not worthy of a hearing. I do not know of any hearings that were held to deal with that story.

The chairman of the committee, one of the members of the committee I saw shortly after the story, the Committee on Agriculture here in Congress, I saw him shortly after the story broke. I asked him what he was going to do about it. He said, "You better believe we're going to hold some hearings and get to the bottom of this." I do not see any record of any hearings being held which got to the bottom of it.

Even now when I call and have my staff try to get information about where we are now with the Farmers Home Loan Administration program, you get vague answers. The figures are right now that at least \$10 billion is outstanding, delinquent, at this point right now, \$10 billion. How much of that will they forgive? They still will not tell us the rules of forgiveness. They still will not tell us how you get that.

We can go after children with disabilities, we can try to wipe those programs out because America cannot afford them. We imply that children with disabilities would bankrupt America. There is a smear campaign going now on all the special education programs.

There is a lot of furor being generated about children with disabilities not being held to the same standard as other children in the school. Yes, they are protected by law. You cannot suspend them or expel them in the same way you do children who do not have disabilities, so they have used that as pretext to smear the programs.

There is a great problem, they say. What if the kid brings a gun to school, a child with a disability brings a gun to school? That is a major problem, it has been played up now. We have got to get rid of guns in the hands of children with disabilities. Ask the question, the simple question, how big is the problem? How many instances of children with disabilities having guns do we have?

The answer is that we do not have any studies, nobody has collected any

information. We just have one or two incidents that they can cite. You can cite one or two incidents to show or prove anything. You can cite some incidents but the problem when you probe a little further, the problem is minuscule. There is no great problem of children with disabilities bringing guns and weapons to school.

But a crisis has been manufactured because this is one more way to smear the programs of children with disabilities. It is one more way to play into a situation where local superintendents and administrators are upset because they have to spend more on the education of children with disabilities than they spend on other children. So they would like to be able to get their hands on that money, and they would do anything to discredit the program for children with disabilities.

I am not saying that the program for children with disabilities does not have some problems. I have been a major critic of certain kinds of excesses. The way they are administered, the way they are handled in New York City has resulted in large numbers of children with a delinquency problem, a discipline problem. They should not be in the program for children with disabilities.

It is a dumping ground for teachers who want to get rid of children who are a problem, but they are discipline problems. There ought to be some way to deal with it. We ought to provide them with some way to better deal with discipline problems, but there are not problems with disabilities. That has been an ongoing criticism that I have of the program. It is a valid criticism that most of them cannot answer.

So we need to deal with that. We need to deal with each problem as it arises. But to smear all of the programs for children with disabilities, and to set the children who do not have disabilities and their education against the smaller percentage of children who do have disabilities, and to try to take the money away from the disability programs in order to solve budget problems in the larger school budget, is unworthy of Americans.

Really we have a problem with funding for schools. These gentlemen here who pride themselves on having cut the budget have cut education funding. Oh, yes, they are going to put back the \$1.1 billion they cut for Title I. I applaud that. I congratulate them. They will put back the \$1.1 billion. But they have cut training programs, teacher education programs, a number of programs that still will not get the money back, and we should have been increasing the amount of money available for education. We should have been increasing it.

We should not be standing here proud of the fact that we made dramatic cuts in education. Instead of the citizens out there, teachers and children and

administrators, all uniting to demand of their governments at every level, whether it is the city governments or the State governments or the Federal Government, instead of demanding at every level that they fund education programs consistent with 20th century demands before we go off into the 21st century, they fund money to bring the school buildings up to date so they can be wired properly and have high-tech equipment like computers and science equipment that is needed. Instead of making the demand on the government, instead of waging the war on the people who make decisions in our government, too many of them are willing to engage in cannibalism. Too many are willing to try to eat what exists. They are going to eat up, devour the special education programs in order to satisfy the needs of the rest of the budget.

I think that is a harsh way to put it, but I can think of no other way except to say that that is happening. Right now the programs for children with disabilities are in great trouble because that is being used as an excuse by certain decisionmakers here in Congress for chipping away at these tiny programs that are already too small, that serve children with disabilities.

Big shots, nobody wants to talk about that. We have not had a single hearing on the Federal Reserve slush fund. If the CIA oversight committee has had a hearing, then I have not heard about it. The Intelligence Committee probably is dealing with that but they do not tell us, so I cannot say a hearing did not take place.

Some people, however, have challenged me. Some people who have heard me talk about this before have called and said, "You know, you make these charges against the CIA. How do you know? On what basis do you make these charges?"

I want you to know that I am not a member of the Intelligence Committee, so I have no oversight responsibilities there. I do not get a chance to see the actual figures, and I am like any other American, I read the New York Times and I read the Washington Post, and I read other newspapers who have their sources.

On several occasions, in several of these papers, I have read that at least \$2 billion was found in an audit of the CIA, and going beyond just stating that \$2 billion was found in an audit, there was an article which appeared in the New York Times on Tuesday, February 27, 1996 which talked in great detail about actions taken to remedy the situation: "Spy Satellite Agency Heads Are Ousted For Lost Money." That is the headline for this article.

"The top two managers of the National Reconnaissance Office, the secret agency that builds spy satellites, were dismissed today after losing track of more than \$2 billion in classified

money." That is the first paragraph of this article by Tim Weiner. It does not say it is alleged. It does not say "sources say." It states it as a fact.

"The Director of Central Intelligence, John Deutch, and Defense Secretary William Perry announced"—oh, there was an announcement—"that they had asked the director of the Reconnaissance Office, Jeffrey K. Harris, and the Deputy Director, Jimmie D. Hall, to step down." Then it goes on and explains how \$2 billion got lost and the President did not know about it and the director of the agency did not know about it.

Mr. Speaker, I include this article that appeared on February 27 in the New York Times in its entirety in the RECORD because I do not want people to continue to question my accuracy. Here is an article which I think names names, talks about announcements, and it clearly establishes that \$2 billion was lost.

[The New York Times National, Tuesday, Feb. 27, 1996]

SPY SATELLITE AGENCY HEADS ARE OUSTED FOR LOST MONEY (By Tim Weiner)

WASHINGTON, Feb. 26—The top two managers of the National Reconnaissance Office, the secret agency that builds spy satellites, were dismissed today after losing track of more than \$2 billion in classified money.

The Director of Central Intelligence, John Deutch, and Defense Secretary William J. Perry announced that they had asked the director of the reconnaissance office, Jeffrey K. Harris, and the deputy director, Jimmie D. Hall, to step down.

"This action is dictated by our belief that N.R.O.'s management practices must be improved and the credibility of this excellent organization must be restored," Mr. Deutch and Mr. Perry wrote in a statement. A Government official close to Mr. Deutch said the intelligence chief had lost confidence in the officials' ability to manage the reconnaissance office's secret funds.

Keith Hall, a senior intelligence official who has managed satellite programs for the Pentagon, was named today as deputy director and acting director of the reconnaissance office.

The reconnaissance office is a secret Government contracting agency that spends \$5 billion to \$6 billion a year—the exact budget is a secret—running the nation's spy satellite program. The satellites take highly detailed pictures from deep space and eavesdrop on telecommunications; everything about them including their cost, is classified. The secret agency is hidden within the Air Force and is overseen jointly by Mr. Deutch and Mr. Perry.

But overseeing intelligence agencies, especially an agency as secretive as the reconnaissance office, whose very existence was an official secret until 1992, is no easy matter. Well-run intelligence services deceive outsiders; poorly run ones fool themselves. This apparently was the case with the reconnaissance office.

Its managers lost track of more than \$2 billion that had accrued in several separate classified accounts over the past few years, according to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. The committee had thought the sum was a mere \$1.2 billion until auditors called in by Mr. Deutch found at least

\$800 million more in the reconnaissance office's secret books this winter.

The auditors told Mr. Deutch that the way the reconnaissance office handled its accounts was so arcane, so obscured by secrecy and complexity and so poorly managed that a \$2 billion bulge in its ledgers had gone unreported.

"Deutch did not know, Perry did not know and Congress did not know" about the surplus, an intelligence official said. "There was a lack of clarity as to how much money was there and how much was needed." The audit is continuing and is expected to be completed by April.

The reconnaissance office also spent more than \$300 million on a new headquarters outside Washington in the early 1990's. The Senate intelligence committee, which appropriates classified money for intelligence agencies, said it was unaware of the cost. In the only public hearing ever held on the subject of the National Reconnaissance Office, Mr. Hill testified in 1994 that the construction of the building was a covert operation and the money for it had been broken into separate classified accounts to conceal its existence.

The reconnaissance office is one of 13 intelligence agencies under Mr. Deutch. All will be covered in a report to be issued on Friday by a Presidential commission on the future of intelligence. The report will address the question of whether government spending for intelligence—an estimated \$26 billion to \$28 billion a year—should continue to be officially secret.

Of course the Federal Reserve Board has not denied the fact that \$3.7 billion or more, it may be close to \$4 billion that the Federal Reserve Board had on hand, unused, as part of its rainy day fund. That has not been denied. I will not quote articles. There are plenty of documents around which validate that.

Why do I go on like this? What does it have to do with the 11th Congressional District in Brooklyn? The 11th Congressional District in Brooklyn is made up of people, a large percentage of which are poor. We are 1 of the 25 poorest congressional districts in the country.

It varies, of course. There are some areas where we have middle class homes and people who have a little more substance, but in a community like Brownsville, for instance, or in a community like East Flatbush, for instance, there are large numbers of poor people. Then there are also middle-class people who have enough money to try to buy a co-op in a large building.

There is a building that I was in last Saturday which has more than 100 units. We have some pretty big buildings in my district. In fact, I have the smallest congressional district in the country. My congressional district covers only 10 square miles, 581,000 people in 10 square miles, so you can imagine how many tall buildings I must have in my district.

Here is a building that I went into at the request of lieutenants where, of the 100 units, a process was begun several years ago to co-op the building, so the owner of the building started selling co-ops. Twenty people paid down their

down payments and they got their loans and they owned their apartments.

Along comes the savings and loan debacle. Remember that one? That, I have talked about so often, is this big shots again. I have talked about the savings and loan swindle, the biggest swindle in the history of mankind, where the total might become as high as a half a trillion dollars, \$500 billion, before it is all over.

Savings and loans will be in front of us again soon. I understand we have to vote on a thrift fund package. The thrift fund package is a package established to help bail out savings and loan units. They sold bonds, and now the bonds will come due and there is no money to pay. It is very complicated.

I talk about it because I am not concerned with high finances and I am not concerned with trying to do the job of the Banking Committee. I am only concerned about the little people in my district in this building who are the victims of the ultimate slime, the ultimate feces that goes down as a result of failure of big banks that were loosely regulated, badly regulated, and they were allowed to give these loans without proper collateral. They were allowed to let landlords and owners do very tricky financing, so that in addition to a mortgage being on each apartment in this building that was sold, the landlord had a wraparound mortgage for the whole building.

□ 2145

When the collapse came as a result of there not being the kind of value there that he had been allowed to assert was there, it was a savings and loan institution that had to suffer the collapse. It was a large organization like Freddie Mac here in Washington that ended up buying the building, and Freddie Mac is now the owner of the building. The 20 people who had equity, money invested, have lost all of their money, because through the complicated maneuverings of the high finance and the real estate financing, which I do not pretend to understand, the building reverted back to a rental building totally. So it is a rental building now, and the people who thought they owned their apartments who owe \$90,000, \$60,000 to \$90,000 on their apartments, now own nothing, unless something drastic is done.

In addition to that, Freddie Mac, and Freddie Mac is a Washington-based institution, a national institution, and I am citing Freddie Mac because Freddie Mac, I intend to come after you. I want you to help resolve this problem. The little people in my district, little people, in this case who are working people, who have enough assets to be able to have started the process of trying to own their own apartment, they are out there in the cold. And Freddie Mac and its cohorts have hired rental agents

and managing companies and they are trying to get their money by neglecting the building. The plumbing in the building is outrageous.

I was carried on a tour through the building, and I saw the building which is 10 stories high, it means the plumbing is bad, it is bad all the way down that line. And the people on the bottom, I guess they get the worst of it. And one lady talked about having to use boots in her apartment for a long period of time before they did some repairs. But the repairs have by no means been completed. The ceilings are open, the drips are still there.

What does this have to do with savings and loans swindles, what does it have to do with the failure of the Congress to properly regulate savings and loans? What does it have to do with the fact that most savings and loan crooks got off without going to prison, paying the money back? What does it have to do with the fact that we cannot get a decent clear report as to the status of the savings and loan bailout now? What does it have to do with the fact we are going to be voting very soon again on another appropriation for the savings and loan bailout, while we are cutting programs for children with disabilities, cutting programs for opportunities to learn education? How does it all tie together? How does it all tie together with my assertion that the rich and famous and powerful seem to get away with everything, while we scrutinize and oppress the people at the very bottom?

The people who are the tenants in this building, the people who thought they were owners of those co-ops, they are the people at the very bottom. They are in my district. I will not waste my time here on these high financial matters trying to reform government or expose the fact that there is no reform, that big government is as big as it ever was when it comes to the rich and powerful, and nobody is seeking to really bring the rich and powerful to heel. Nobody is dealing with the uncollected debts that amount to \$55 billion. Nobody is dealing with the savings and loan scandal that keeps going, quietly. We are taking care of that. But every time the savings and loan debacle says to Congress we need more money, we appropriate more money. We get a message, it has to happen. The financial markets are going to collapse if we do not appropriate more money.

A very interesting matter arose in Japan. Here I am going across the water. You think I am rambling? No. In Japan they have a savings and loan scandal. They have a banking scandal similar to the American savings and loan scandal, a huge situation where large numbers of banks are collapsing, real estate markets are collapsing. The government is called upon to bail out the situation.

I thought it was very interesting the reaction of some Japanese legislators. You know, we sweetheated the process here in America. Both parties, together, became mum and they never had hearings to expose the criminality of the savings and loan banks and the other banks that were also more regular banks collapsed. Savings and loan, we called it the savings and loan debacle because they started it. There were other banks, larger amounts of money, and they were also regular banks under the jurisdiction of the FDIC and Federal Reserve Board. We had all these controls and regulations, and still there was so much collusion from one level to another, the decision makers in bed with the regulators, and the regulators in bed with the banks.

It was a once-in-the-history-of-mankind situation. No swindle has ever been pulled off as great as that, and no swindle has ever taken place where so many people got away with it.

So much crime that did pay. It paid billions of dollars. But in Japan, you have a very unusual thing that happened. The story in the New York Times says that one Japanese party staged a sit-in in the legislature. They blocked the chambers where the debate was taking place on the bailout for the banks. Very interesting. If you want to know what the possibilities are, what more we could have done, then I will quote this article a little bit and you will see what the Japanese did, faced with the same situation.

The savings and loans collapsed, real estate market collapsed, it resulted in little people at the very bottom suffering greatly, like the people in my district who were suffering in this one building. All their money gone down the drain, now they have to fight a landlord and a management company that will not even repair the pipes. A group of tenants were taken to court on Monday, and I went down to the court. They postponed the case. Those people had all taken off from work to go. Now the case is postponed and they have to come back. The little people are harassed even by the court system.

How does it all relate back to Japan and the politicians in Japan becoming so militant and so angry that they staged a sit-in? Some of Japan's leading politicians are spending their time in a sit-in. This was reported in the New York Times on March 16, 1996.

"It is a battleground, said Kojimoro Moto," quoting from the article:

a member of the House of Representatives who is also an organizer of the sit-in which at the time of this report was in its second week. When they said it is a battleground, that is a bit of an exaggeration perhaps, but there is no mistaking the seriousness of the conflict. Those protesting are the main opposition group, the New Frontier Party, and they have succeeded in paralyzing the Japanese budget process. The New Frontier Party's aim is to block the passage of the budget bill for next year. The party objects to an

unpopular provision in the bill to use about \$6.8 billion in taxpayer money to absorb losses in the liquidation of seven of the nation's bankrupt mortgage lenders.

Let me just repeat that:

The New Frontier Party was sitting in in the legislature of Japan blocking the budget process from going forward, and their aim is to block the passage of the budget bill for next year.

The party objects to an unpopular provision to use about \$6.8 billion in taxpayer money to absorb losses in the liquidation of seven of the nation's bankrupt mortgage lenders.

This is a bailout for the banks similar to the savings & loan bailout in this country.

Now, I was in Congress when the bailout began here for the savings & loans in this country. We never had a figure as low as \$6.8 billion. I think the first bailout money was \$7 billion, and it got higher. It got to \$50 billion, \$75 billion, and we kept being told "it is off budget, so don't worry about it."

Off budget does not mean the taxpayers do not still pay. That means in the calculations for the budget that year, you do not have to figure it. It becomes part of the deficit.

We appropriated never as little as \$6.8 billion. But the Japanese members of the legislature, the equivalent of Congresspersons, were sitting in to block that from going forward.

We are going to have on this floor within a few days a bill to continue the bailout of the savings & loans called the Thrift Fund. While we are cutting programs for children, programs for the elderly, while we are going after Medicaid, Medicaid is on the agenda, Medicaid will be cut, the bargaining process that goes on between the white House and the Republican majority here is such that the Republican majority always wins something, and every step of the way they have won some cuts, so we can expect Medicaid will be cut. That is the least that we can expect.

The most that we can expect is that Medicaid will be given to the States. All the Governors, both Democrat and Republican, have decided, voted, they wanted Medicaid to be made a block grant. Take away the entitlement and give it to the States.

So those cuts are going to go forward at the same time we have voted for a \$6 billion increase in defense, and we are now going to be voting to bail out more of the banks. It is going to be billions of dollars. They will not come with a few hundred million, I assure you.

Let me go back to the Japanese. To quote from the article about the Japanese sit-in,

"Critics of the bill say that \$6.8 billion is just the beginning of the bailout, for the banks are saddled with at least \$400 billion in bad debt. The provision has prompted a public outcry against bankers and bureaucrats, who many believe are responsible not only for the nation's bad debt, but also for the stagnant economy."

I will not read any more at this time. I just want to draw the parallel. Nobody on this floor has ever mentioned the fact that the Japanese have a swindle, a scandal, of the same dimensions, did you hear what I just said, the \$6.8 billion is just the beginning. They think they have a problem of at least \$400 billion.

In this country, we never got a figure, but it always kept growing. Stanford University at one point, who had more of the figures that anybody else, estimated that the savings & loan bailout in America, the greatest swindle in the history of mankind, would cost the American taxpayers \$500 billion, half a trillion dollars, before it was over.

We cannot yet clear reports. We do not know how close we are to the \$500 billion yet. But it is affecting everybody at the lower levels in this country, the ordinary Americans. You are being made to suffer for what the rich and powerful have walked off with.

Even the \$5.15 per hour minimum wage now is being seen as a threat. We are told that the American economy will suffer. Industry is trembling because we have a proposal to raise the minimum wage by 45 cents per hour per year, 45 cents per hour in one year and 45 cents an hour in another year, which means after 2 years the minimum wage increases would go from \$4.25 to \$5.15 per hour. \$5.15 per hour is called a threat to the American economy.

The little guys on the bottom, everything is too much for them. The guys on the top can get away with billion dollar slush funds, they can wreck the banking economy and the taxpayers are forced to bail them out through the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. But the little guys on the bottom asking for \$5.15 per hour for their labor, it does not even come out of the Treasury. The American Government does not have to pay the \$5.15 per hour. The Government does not subsidize wages paid by industry. It does not come out of the taxpayers' money. It comes out of the industries that hire the people.

But there are some here in the leadership of the recommend and majority who have indicated that they will not have any hearings or discussions on a minimum wage. They indicated that earlier in the year. And that if we pass the minimum wage increase this year, it will be "over their dead body." That strong statement was made by a leader of the Republican majority.

Fortunately, public opinion in America is galloping forward. Fortunately, public opinion understands that this is ridiculous. Public opinion is comparing the prosperity on Wall Street and the large amounts of money being paid to stockholders and the large amounts of money being paid to corporate executives, my colleague here before from Chicago was talking about the gap between the corporate pay of executives and the amount of money people are

earning at the very bottom, and Americans are not dumb. Fortunately, public opinion, by more than 76 percent, says that we ought to have an increase in the minimum wage in America.

□ 2200

Fortunately, the hearts of the American people are still not so hard and so corrupted that they cannot understand the arithmetic of \$5.15 per hour, which comes out to a little more than \$9,000 per year. Right now people are making about \$8,000 a year on minimum wage. They would be making about \$9,000.

Another thousand dollars would make a big difference in the lives of people in terms of groceries on the table, shoes for the kids, the payment of a light bill, the phone bill. It is not a small amount for poor people, for those at the very bottom, and most people cannot sympathize here in this Congress. We can forgive billions of dollars in loans for farmers' home loan mortgages, but we cannot see the need to give \$5.15 as a wage, hourly wage, for people who are working.

We have had many attacks on welfare mothers, which is a misnomer, because the Federal Government does not pay money to mothers. The mothers of children who are considered dependent children receive the checks on behalf of the children. Aid to Families with Dependent Children has been under one steady stream of attack. It is all over just about now. They are going to take away the entitlement. They have made the cuts. But it is a small program. It is a tiny program compared to the farm subsidy program, for example.

The farm subsidy program, which allows Louisiana, part of the reason Louisiana gets so much money, and I am going to tie this together now, part of the reason Louisiana gets so much money from the Federal Government is because not only does it have military installations there, but it also has farm subsidies it gets from Washington.

The State that gets the highest amount of money from the Federal Government per capita is New Mexico. In terms of what it pays in, New Mexico gets back more per person than any other State. Why? Because New Mexico has the largest, a large number of farm subsidies, programs that receive subsidies from the Federal Government. New Mexico is at the top per capita, \$3,255 more per person they get from the Federal Government than they pay into the Federal Government.

What did the gentleman who was speaking here before from the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, what do they do about the fact that New Mexico is at the top of the list? Farm subsidies for the rich and the powerful, because farmers do not have to prove they are poor in order to get subsidies. Farmers do not have to prove anything except that they are farmers and they

have land. They get paid for not plowing the land or not planting grain and nobody asks them how poor are you or how many in your family. Farmers just get it. They are rich and they are powerful or they are hooked into organizations that are powerful. So in America the rich and the powerful are definitely not subjected to the kinds of budget cuts and the scrutiny that the children in the lunchroom are.

We are going to force teachers to walk around the lunchroom and pick out immigrant children and make sure no immigrant child gets a free lunch paid for partially by the Federal Government.

I want to make a correction here on my statement on minimum wage. The Republican majority said they would not have any hearings, no discussion on minimum wage at the beginning of this Congress. But because the pressure has been applied steadily by the American people, because common sense has said you ought to discuss it and you ought to pass and increase the minimum wage, we now have a situation where the Republicans are willing to discuss minimum wage and a proposal is being made.

Some Republicans, I think about 20, have introduced a bill which says they want to raise the minimum wage by not 90 cents over 2 years but a dollar over 2 years. That is a small group of the Republican majority, about 20 people. The leadership of the Republican majority has introduced a proposal. They do not want to increase the minimum wage. You will do that over their dead bodies, they say. But they have a proposal called the Minimum Wage for Families Act. I have a copy of the outline in my hand. And this proposal, which is going to sidestep making industry pay more than \$4.25 per hour, will have the Federal Government step in to subsidize the wages.

Let the industries keep hiring people at \$4.25 an hour, the Federal Government will then step in and give people additional money who are working. You talk about a farm subsidy; now we are going to have a subsidy for industry, corporations and businesses. You will get a subsidy, and every person who has one child will not get \$4.25 hour, the Federal Government will give them an additional \$3.75, so that they will get \$7 an hour. And if they have two or more children, the Federal Government will give them enough money to make their pay come out to \$8 an hour.

Now, can you see millions of workers across America having the Federal Government involved in their pay? This is an intrusion by Government that we have never had before. It will be on a scale greater than telling the farmers what to plant and telling the farmers how to grow their crops because they are getting money from the Government. We are going to have mil-

lions of workers involved in a program where the Government is going to help industry bring people's wages up.

How is it going to do this? The Government is going to take the money from the earned income tax credit. They want to raid the earned income tax credit and use it for working people in these industries and have the Internal Revenue Service, on a regular basis, every 2 weeks, the Internal Revenue Service will now have the job of paying the difference between the \$4.25 per hour and the amount due to each person in accordance with what has been decided by the Government.

Can you imagine what kind of bureaucracy we are talking about there, in a Congress that prides itself on downsizing the Federal Government? The Federal Government will be intruding like it never has before in the lives of working people. Why do not we just give the \$4.25 to each worker out there who is working? Why do not we just give it to the little people? Why are we going to put the people on the bottom? Because if you are making \$4.25 an hour, economically you are on the very bottom. Why are we going to put them through that when we do not put farmers who receive subsidies?

In Kansas they say the subsidy averages about \$40,000 a year per family. That is the average. Many get much more than that. Forty thousand dollars a year per family. They do not get through a process of scrutiny by the Federal Government to determine whether you have one child or two children or whatever.

Let me summarize. What I am saying is that we have allowed a situation to arise, generated by the majority in this Congress, where there are two sets of Americans, the 80 percent who are ordinary people struggling to make a living, the 80 percent are a part of what my colleague, Mr. LIPINSKI, was talking about, from Chicago, he was talking before I got here, 80 percent who are struggling to make ends meet are being given a hard time in every way by their government.

I think this 80 percent constitutes a caring majority and all together they have enough common sense to see what is happening. I think the caring majority all together will rise to take matters into their own hands at the polling places. I think the caring majority have had enough. I think the people with disabilities are not beggars. They are not people that we have to treat with charity. They have votes.

There are almost 40 million people in this country with disabilities, so when we treat them in a cavalier way in legislation, we are going to reap what we sow. I am confident that the average American on the bottom out there, we the people, will rise and at the ballot box demonstrate that this is a country still for the people and not for the rich

and powerful. We are going to have justice and those who ignore this will have to suffer the consequences.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MENENDEZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for April 23rd and 24th, on account of official travel.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DINGELL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BONIOR, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. REED, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts for 5 minutes today.

Mr. MASCARA, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. LOWEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DURBIN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MANTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island for 5 minutes today.

Mr. TORRES, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MEEHAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. LEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas for 5 minutes today.

Ms. FURSE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. TORRICELLI, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. ESHOO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYWORTH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. TORKILDSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SHADEGG, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOKE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HANSEN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DORNAN, for 5 minutes, today.
(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYWORTH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROTH.
Mr. CRAPO.
Mr. BOEHNER.
Mr. CALLAHAN.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. GEKAS.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
Mr. NETHERCUTT.
Mr. DREIER.
Mr. EMERSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BONIOR.
Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
Mr. KANJORSKI.
Mr. KILDEE.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. GORDON in 10 instances.
Mr. MARKEY.
Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
Mr. CARDIN.
Mr. GEJDESON.
Mr. WILLIAMS.
Mr. KLECZKA.
Mr. SERRANO in two instances.
Mr. FILNER in two instances.
Mr. LANTOS.
Mr. BORSKI.
Mr. WAXMAN.
Mr. JACOBS.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. OWENS) and to include extraneous material:

Mr. WHITFIELD.
Mr. PACKARD in two instances.
Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
Mr. SAWYER.
Mr. COSTELLO.
Mr. RICHARDSON in two instances.
Mr. COX of California.
Mr. MARTINI in two instances.
Mr. CLEMENT.
Mr. VENTO.
Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.
Mr. RADANOVICH in two instances.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
Mr. HUTCHINSON.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 175. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 735. An act to deter terrorism, provide justice for victims, provide for an effective death penalty, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 25, 1996, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2465. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Grading and Inspection, General Specification for Approved Plants and Standards for Grades of Dairy Products; United States Standards for Nonfat Dry Milk (DA-93-03 FR), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2466. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Olives Grown in California and Imported Olives; Establishment of Limited Use Olive Grade and Size Requirements During the 1995-96 Crop Year (FV-95-932-1), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2467. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Hazel-nuts Grown in Oregon and Washington; Order Further Amending Marketing Order (FV-94-982-1 FR), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2468. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Milk in the Central Arizona Marketing Area; Suspension (DA-96-03 FR), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2469. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Limes and Avocados Grown in Florida; Suspension of Certain Volume Regulations and Reporting Requirements (FV-95-911-2 IFR), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2470. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Winter Pears Grown in Oregon, Washington, and California Order Amending the Order (FV-92-065), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2471. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary for Food Safety, Food Safety and Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Use of Sodium Citrate Buffered with Citric Acid in Certain Cured and Uncured Processed Meat and Poultry Products (RIN: 0583-AB97), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2472. A letter from the Administrator, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—U.S. Standards for Barley (RIN: 0580-AA14), pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2473. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting his review of the President's second, third, and fourth special impoundment message for fiscal year 1996, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685 (H. Doc. No. 104-205); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2474. A letter from the Director, Administration and Management, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter relative to a cost comparison study of cleaning services performed at the Pentagon; to the Committee on National Security.

2475. A letter from the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Comptroller of the Currency, Administrator of National Banks, transmitting the Department's final rule—International Banking Activities (RIN: 1557-AB26), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2476. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel, Office of Thrift Supervision, transmitting the Office's final rule—Uniform Rules of Practice and Procedure (RIN: 1550-AA79), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2477. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Thrift Supervision, transmitting the Office's 1996 compensation plan, pursuant to Public Law 101-73, section 1206 (103 Stat. 523); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2478. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the cooperative program for extended air defense (Transmittal No. 08-96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

2479. A letter from the Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting the Agency's report entitled "Report on Economic Conditions in Egypt 1994-95," pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2346 note; to the Committee on International Relations.

2480. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting a quarterly update report on development assistance program allocations as of April 19, 1996, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2413(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

2481. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-248, "Judgment Lien on Property Amendment Act of 1996," pursuant to D.C. Code, Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2482. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-249, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 484, S.O. 90-272, Covenant Filing Extension Temporary Act of 1996," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2483. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-253, "Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Regulation Compact Amendment Act of 1996," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2484. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-255, "Closing of a Portion of T Street, S.W., S.O. 92-56, Act of 1996," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2485. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-256, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 672, S.O. 89-105, Act of 1996," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2486. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final comprehensive management plan, environmental impact statement and record of decision for the City of Rocks National Reserve, pursuant to Public Law 100-696, section 202(b) (102 Stat. 4574); to the Committee on Resources.

2487. A letter from the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that have been adopted by the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072 (H. Doc. No. 104-201); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

2488. A letter from the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure that have been adopted by the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072 (H. Doc. No. 104-202); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

2489. A letter from the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure that have been adopted by the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072 (H. Doc. No. 104-203); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

2490. A letter from the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure that have been adopted by the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2075 (H. Doc. No. 104-204); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

2491. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zones: Elizabeth River and York River, VA (RIN: 2115-AA97), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2492. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Little Potato Slough (RIN: 2115-AE47), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2493. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; San Leandro Bay, CA (RIN: 2115-AE47), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2494. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Vessel Rebuilt Determinations (RIN: 2115-AE35), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2495. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations: City of Lake Worth, FL (RIN: 2115-AE46), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2496. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations: River Race Augusta, GA (RIN: 2115-AE46), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2497. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F25 Mark 0100 Series Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2498. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F27 Mark 050 and Model F28 Mark 0100 Series Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2499. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Constructions Aeronauticas, S.A. (CASA), Model C-212-CB, -CC, -CD, -CE, and -CF Series Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2500. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Hamilton Standard Model 14RF-9 Propellers (RIN: 2120-AA64), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2501. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 Series Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2502. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McCauley Accessory Division, The Cessna Aircraft Co. Model C35, C72, C75, C80, C86, C87, C92, and C93 Series Propellers (RIN: 2120-AA64), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2503. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Jetstream Model 4101 Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2504. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A320-111 Series Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2505. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9, DC-9-8, and MD-90-30 Series Airplanes, Model MD-88 Airplanes, and C-9 (Military) Series Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2506. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Flight Trails Helicopters, Inc., Hardpoint Assemblies Installed on McDonnell Douglas Helicopter Systems Model 369D, 369E, 369F, 369FF, and 500N Helicopters (RIN: 2120-AA64), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2507. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc.,

Model 214ST Helicopters (RIN: 2120-AA64), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2508. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-100, 747-200, and 747-300 Series Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2509. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (RIN: 2120-AA65), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2510. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Model 328-100 Series Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2511. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH (ECD) Model BO-105, BO-105A, BO-105C, BO-105S, and BO-105LS A-1 Helicopters (RIN: 2120-AA64) pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2512. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Equal Employment Opportunity on Federal and Federal-Aid Construction Contracts (Including Supportive Services); Report Requirements (RIN: 2125-AB15), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2513. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (RIN: 2120-AA65), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2514. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Model L-1011-385 Series Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2515. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-400, 757, and 767 Series Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2516. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—General Material Requirements; Warranty Clauses (RIN: 2125-AD61), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2517. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Design Standards for Highways; Geometric Design of Highways and Streets (RIN: 2125-AD38), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2518. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (RIN: 2120-AS65), pursuant

to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2519. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report on Federal agency drug-free workplace plans, pursuant to Public Law 100-71, section 503 (a)(1)(A) (101 Stat. 468); jointly, to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCINNIS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 412. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 104-535). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 2967. A bill to extend the authorization of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 104-536). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HEFLEY:

H.R. 3305. A bill to recognize the heritage of certain areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 3306. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the compensation of certain election officials and election workers which is exempt from Social Security taxes shall also be exempt from income taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEKAS (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. INGALLS of South Carolina, Mr. HOKE, Mr. BONO, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. BARR, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. ZELIFF):

H.R. 3307. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a limitation on sanctions imposed by agencies and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONGLEY (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. COX, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HOKE, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JONES, Mr. KIM, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. METCALF, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. TALENT, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3308. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to limit the placement of U.S. forces under U.N. operational or tactical control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on National Security, and in addition

to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BATEMAN:

H.R. 3309. A bill to authorize the establishment of a pilot program to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DICKEY:

H.R. 3310. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to deny Federal retirement annuities to Members of Congress convicted of any felony, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 3311. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that civilian employees of the National Guard may not be required to wear military uniforms while performing civilian service; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on National Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HARMAN:

H.R. 3312. A bill to expand the authority of the Department of Defense to donate unusable food; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BROWDER, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 3313. A bill to amend the Goals 2000: Educate America Act to allow local educational agencies to participate in certain programs if the State in which the agency is located does not participate; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. REGULA:

H.R. 3314. A bill to assess the impact of the NAFTA, to require further negotiation of certain provisions of the NAFTA, to establish a commission to review the dispute settlement reports of the World Trade Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 3315. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the rate of tax on liquefied natural gas shall be equivalent to the rate of tax on compressed natural gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VENTO:

H.R. 3316. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to revise the treatment of deferred compensation plans of State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 3317. A bill to establish the Yellowstone River Valley Heritage Area in the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 3318. A bill to establish the Southwest Montana Heritage and Recreation Area in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ZIMMER:

H.R. 3319. A bill to require that the United States promptly sue for recovery of costs

and damages for the cleanup of the Stepan Property Superfund Site in Bergen County, NJ; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. CHRYSLER, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. HANSEN, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. FRISA, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BURR, Mr. GOSS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. BONO, Mr. DREIER, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. NORWOOD):

H.J. Res. 176. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the Federal income tax; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SALMON, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H. Con. Res. 167. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 10th anniversary of the Chernobyl nuclear disaster, and supporting the closing of the Chernobyl nuclear power plant; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan (for himself, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H. Res. 413. Resolution recognizing the importance of a nationally designated "Character Counts Week" and of the character development of young people to the present and future of the United States, and encouraging community, school, and youth organizations to integrate the "six core elements

of character" articulated in the Aspen Declaration into programs for students and children; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 240: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 791: Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 878: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. TORKILSEN.

H.R. 940: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1023: Mr. DURBIN.
H.R. 1202: Mrs. ROUKEMA.
H.R. 1210: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1279: Mr. GRAHAM and Ms. GREENE of Utah.

H.R. 1386: Mr. DEUTSCH.
H.R. 1846: Mr. BROWN of California.
H.R. 1998: Mr. ROTH and Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 2009: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2019: Mr. JACKSON.
H.R. 2092: Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 2137: Ms. JACKSON-LEE.
H.R. 2508: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 2688: Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2697: Mr. KLECZKA and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 2715: Mr. WELLER.
H.R. 2764: Ms. RIVERS and Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 2827: Mr. CAMPBELL.
H.R. 2925: Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. JONES, and Mr. BURR.

H.R. 2939: Mr. EVANS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LEACH, Mr. WARD, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 2951: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LUTHER, and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 2976: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. YATES.
H.R. 3004: Mr. DURBIN and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 3052: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. YATES, Mr.

LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. DANNER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana.

H.R. 3114: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 3142: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 3161: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 3173: Mr. VENTO and Mr. FOX.

H.R. 3234: Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. EWING, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. BARR, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MICA, Mr. BASS, Mr. JONES, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. LAHOOD, and Ms. DUNN of Washington.

H.R. 3246: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 3257: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 3260: Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 3265: Mr. GREEN of Texas and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 3303: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. FARR, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.J. Res. 16: Ms. GREENE of Utah.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. MOORHEAD.

H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. LUTHER.

H. Con. Res. 120: Ms. DELAURO.

H. Con. Res. 152: Mr. TEJEDA.

H. Res. 346: Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H. Res. 385: Mr. MURTHA, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. VISLOSKEY.

H. Res. 399: Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. JACKSON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. YATES, Mr. PORTER, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1202: Mr. COBLE.